United Nations A/AC.254/4/Rev.4

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 July 1999

Original: English

Ad Hoc Committee on the Elaboration of a Convention against Transnational Organized Crime
Fifth session
Vienna, 4-15 October 1999
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*
Consideration of the draft United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, with particular emphasis on articles 4, 4 *bis*, 7, 7 *bis*, 7 *ter* 10, 14 (paras. 14-22) and 15-19

Revised draft United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime[1]

Article 1[2]
Statement of objectives

The purpose of this Convention is to promote cooperation to prevent and combat transnational organized crime more effectively.

* A/AC.254/18.

[1] In the present text, certain words, sentences or entire paragraphs have been placed in square brackets, which in some cases may indicate that the text in question has not been discussed or that delegations have expressly stated that the text requires further consideration.

[2] Several delegations proposed the following order for the first four articles in both the Convention and the optional Protocols: article 1 (Purpose), article 2 (Definitions), article 3 (Scope of application) and article 4 (Criminalization).

Article 2
Scope of application[3]

1. The Convention shall, except as otherwise provided herein,[4] apply to the prevention,[5] investigation and prosecution of serious crime involving a [transnational] organized criminal group as defined in article 2 *bis* and the offences established in articles 3 and 4.[6]

[2. This Convention shall not apply where the offence is committed within a single State, all members of the criminal group are nationals of that State and the victims are nationals or entities of that State, except that the provisions of articles concerning judicial assistance may, as appropriate, apply where the offence is serious and of an organized nature.][7]

3. States Parties shall carry out their obligations under this Convention in a manner consistent with the principles of sovereign equality and territorial integrity of States and that of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

---

[3] At its second session, the Ad Hoc Committee decided to continue its work on the basis of the revised text of article 2 (see A/AC.254/4/Rev.1). The Ad Hoc Committee decided that a provision originally to be found in this article on criteria for deciding whether or not an offence was committed by an organized criminal group could be used as a point of reference in reviewing, for example, article 14 (Mutual legal assistance). The Ad Hoc Committee also accepted a compromise proposal by its Chairman that a list of offences, which could be either indicative or exhaustive, such as the list originally contained in this article (provided in the attachment), could be included either in an annex to the Convention or in the *travaux préparatoires*. That list would, however, need to be supplemented with proposals from States (for details, see the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its second session (A/AC.254/11)).

[4] One delegation noted that, in certain cases, owing to the fact that an investigation was at a preliminary stage, it might not be possible for a requested State to establish with certainty that a particular offence was connected to organized crime. That should be taken into consideration in determining the scope of application of the various articles dealing with international cooperation, such as mutual legal assistance.

[5] The delegation of Oman was of the view that the word "prevention" should be deleted, as this article should deal only with the scope of application of the Convention.

[6] The delegation of the Philippines proposed the following rewording of paragraph 1 of this article:

> "1. Except as otherwise provided herein, the Convention shall apply to the prevention, investigation and prosecution of transnational organized crime. For this purpose, 'transnational organized crime' refers to a serious crime that is committed by an organized criminal group and that has an international dimension, such as, but not limited to, the following: (a) if the offence is committed within two or more States; or (b) if the members of the criminal group are nationals of two or more States; or (c) if the offence is committed in one State but the victim is a national or entity of another State; or (d) if the offence is committed in one State but planned, directed or controlled in another State."

The delegation of the Philippines also proposed the deletion of paragraph 2 of this article as it would be superseded by the revised paragraph 1.

[7] This paragraph was previously an option of paragraph 5 of this article. It was retained in brackets pending a decision on the retention of the bracketed word "transnational" in paragraph 1.

The delegation of Mexico proposed the following formulation:

> "2. The present Convention shall not apply if the offence is committed within a single State, if all members of the criminal group are nationals of or have substantial links with that State, if all victims are nationals or entities of that State and if the effects of the offence are produced only in that State [with the proviso that the provisions of the articles concerning judicial assistance may, as appropriate, apply where the offence is serious and of an organized nature]."

The delegation of Mexico specified that the inclusion of the part of the sentence in brackets would depend on the definition of serious crime.

The delegation of Oman suggested that the words "all members of the criminal group" should be replaced with the words "all or one of the members of the criminal group" to ensure that the presence of a foreign element in the offence would not constitute a transnational crime.

4. [Nothing in this Convention entitles a State Party to][8] [A State Party shall not][9] undertake in the territory of another State the exercise of jurisdiction and performance of functions that are reserved exclusively for the authorities of that other State by its domestic law.

[*Paragraphs moved*][10]

Article 2 bis
Use of terms[11]

For the purposes of this Convention:

(a) "Organized criminal group" means a structured[12] group [of three or more persons][13] existing for a period of time and having the aim of committing a serious [transnational][14] crime[15] [through concerted action][16] [by using intimidation, violence,

[8] This language is derived from article 18 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (General Assembly resolution 52/164, annex). One delegation also suggested that article 19, paragraph 1, of the same Convention might be relevant in this regard.

[9] This language is derived from the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988.

[10] Pursuant to a decision of the Ad Hoc Committee at its second session, the provision on the relation between the Convention and the Protocols thereto is dealt with in article 26 *bis*.

[11] It was noted that other terms used in the Convention should also be defined. In the context of the discussion on article 15, the following terms were noted by some delegations as requiring definition: "controlled delivery", "surveillance, including electronic surveillance" and "undercover operations". [*Rapporteur's note*. The definition of "controlled delivery" used in the 1988 Convention was accepted as the basis and is included in an adapted form that was not discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee at its first session.] It was also suggested that those definitions could be inserted into the *travaux préparatoires*.

Two delegations proposed that the term "transnational organized crime" be defined. The delegation of India proposed the following definition: "Transnational organized crime is any serious crime that either has ramifications in more than one country or is perpetrated in any one country by an organized criminal group operating from the territory of another country."

As mentioned in footnote 2, some delegations noted that the practice in international instruments was to place the article on definitions immediately after the first article, containing the statement of objectives.

[12] The delegation of India proposed that the term "structured" be deleted or replaced by a more appropriate term.

[13] Some delegations supported the minimum number of three persons. Other delegations proposed that the minimum number be two. Still other delegations were of the opinion that no minimum number of group members needed to be stated and that the reference should only be to a "group".

[14] Some delegations proposed that the word "transnational" be inserted into the definition under subparagraph (a), replacing "serious crime" with "serious transnational crime". Other delegations opposed such a proposal on the ground that it would considerably limit the scope of the Convention and moreover that the qualifier "transnational" had been inserted into article 1, which set out the objective of the Convention.

The delegation of Croatia noted that references in the text of the Convention to "serious crime" should be amended to "serious offences".

[15] The delegation of India proposed the deletion of the phrases "existing for a period of time" and "having the aim of committing serious crime".

[16] Some delegations proposed that this phrase should further qualify "organized criminal group".

corruption or other means][17] in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit;[18]

(b) "Serious crime" means conduct constituting a criminal offence punishable by a maximum deprivation of liberty of at least [...] years[19] or a more serious penalty;[20]

---

[17] The insertion of a reference to the means of commission was supported by some delegations. Other delegations noted that such an inclusion might lead to ambiguity or create loopholes that could be exploited by organized criminal groups. One delegation noted that the use of such instrumental means could be an aggravating factor in sentencing.

[18] At its second session, the Ad Hoc Committee engaged in an extensive discussion on the limitation to "financial and other material benefit". Some delegations expressly requested that the words "a financial or other material benefit" be placed in brackets. The Chairman indicated that the substance of the discussion would be provided in an explanatory note, which would become part of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Some delegations noted that, in view of the mandate given to the Ad Hoc Committee by the General Assembly, a definition that referred only to "obtaining a financial and other material benefit" as a motive for criminal activity was too limited. The delegation of Turkey noted that if that reference remained in its present formulation, the Convention would be unacceptable. Some delegations proposed that the reference to the purpose of the group be deleted from the definition on the grounds that such an intention might be difficult to prove.

Some delegations noted that the reference to "other material benefit" should not exclude circumstances where the objectives of the organized criminal group were directed towards illegal personal or sexual gratification, as in the case of "paedophilic networks".

Several other delegations supported the limitation in the provision to "obtaining a financial or other material benefit". Those delegations noted that although organized criminal groups might commit, for example, murders, those acts could nonetheless be seen as being indirectly intended to obtain a financial or other material benefit, and would thus fall within the scope of the definition.

Specific proposals in this respect were made. Those proposals are presented below.

The delegation of Egypt proposed that the definition end with "financial or other material benefit or any other illegitimate objective using violence, intimidation or corruption".

The delegation of Colombia had proposed the following definition at the first session (see A/AC.254/L.2): " 'Organized crime' means illegal activity of two or more persons, with hierarchical links or personal relationships, whether or not of a permanent nature, aimed at obtaining economic advantages by means of violence, intimidation or corruption". The delegation of Uruguay proposed that the reference to material and financial means could end with the words "also when those benefits are sought for political or other purposes".

The delegation of Colombia subsequently submitted an oral proposal that the definition of an "organized criminal group" refer to a group of natural persons who commit serious crime covered by the present Convention (or an annex thereto) (see footnote 3 above).

The delegation of Mexico proposed the following definition (see A/AC.254/5/Add.3): "It is understood that transnational organized crime exists when three or more persons agree to organize or are organized, on a permanent or recurring basis, to commit acts that in themselves or when combined with others have as an objective or result the commission of a crime or crimes that are identified in article 2 and over which two or more States Parties have established their jurisdiction, in accordance with article 9 of this Convention."

The delegation of Slovakia proposed the insertion of the words "infiltration into the public or economic structure" after the words "or other material benefit".

The delegation of Belgium proposed that consideration be given to excluding from the scope of application of the Convention organizations with solely political objectives and organizations whose purpose was solely humanitarian, philosophical or religious. Several delegations expressed their support for this limitation of the scope.

[19] Some delegations, while not taking a position at the second session on the number of years to be inserted here, expressed a preference for a high number of years.

Some delegations proposed that reference also be made to a minimum period of deprivation of liberty. Some other delegations noted that in their view this would be unnecessary.

[20] Some delegations noted that establishment of seriousness on the basis of the length of possible sentence might lead to difficulties in practice, owing to differences in penal systems. Some delegations noted that the issue of seriousness should be decided in accordance with the domestic legislation of the two States concerned in a case. Other delegations proposed that the seriousness of crime be assessed not only in view of the level of

(i) For the purpose of implementing articles [...] of this Convention [pertaining to criminalization under articles 3 and 4 and other domestic obligations], a State Party shall consider this definition to refer to a criminal offence under its laws;

(ii) For the purpose of implementing articles [...] of this Convention [pertaining to international cooperation], a State Party may deny cooperation as to conduct that would not also constitute a serious crime under its laws;[21]

(c) "Structured group" means a group that is not randomly formed for the immediate commission of a crime and that needs not have formally defined roles for its participants, the continuity of its membership or a developed structure;[22]

(d) "Existing for a period of time" means being of sufficient duration for the formation of an agreement or plan to commit a criminal act;[23]

[(e) "Property" means assets of every kind, whether corporeal or incorporeal, movable or immovable, tangible or intangible, and legal documents or instruments evidencing title to, or interest in, such property;

(f) "Proceeds of crime" means any property derived from or obtained, directly or indirectly, through the commission of any offence established in article(s) [...] [of an offence covered by this Convention];[24]

(g) "Freezing or seizure" means the ordering by the competent authority of the temporary prohibition of the transfer, conversion, exchange, disposal or realization of property and the temporary custody or control thereof;

(h) "Confiscation", which includes forfeiture where applicable, means the permanent deprivation of property, proceeds or instrumentalities of an offence by order of a court or other competent authority;][25]

---

punishment, but also in view of how the offence was qualified under national law. The delegation of Croatia suggested that reference be made to the "nature of the offence" and to the "pattern of action of the organized criminal group". In addition, some delegations noted that reference could also be made to the list of offences that, as noted above in footnote 3 to article 2, could be inserted into an annex to the Convention or in the *travaux préparatoires*.

[21] Some delegations proposed the deletion of both subparagraphs (b) (i) and (ii). The delegation of Kuwait proposed this deletion, provided that the period of punishment was fixed at three years, and the addition of the following phrase: "pursuant to the provisions of domestic laws of States Parties" (see A/AC.254/L.12).

[22] One delegation was of the view that one determinant of a "structured group" was that it had a hierarchy. Two delegations proposed the deletion of the words "or a developed structure". Some delegations noted that reference could be made to the "permanent or recurring nature" of the activity of the group.

[23] The delegation of Norway noted that a reading of the definitions in subparagraphs (a)-(d) suggested that the Convention could have an excessively wide scope. The delegation proposed that subparagraph (d) be deleted and that subparagraph (c) end with the words "commission of a crime". Another delegation proposed the deletion of both subparagraph (c) and subparagraph (d).

[24] The scope of this Convention is still subject to deliberation. For this reason, throughout the present text the alternatives "an offence established in article(s) [...]" (which in the current draft would be article 3 (Participation in a criminal organization), and article 4 (Money-laundering)) and "an offence covered by this Convention" (which would have a broader scope, as established by article 2) are provided, as appropriate.

[25] Subparagraphs (e)-(h) were submitted by Colombia at the first session (A/AC.254/L.2). [*Rapporteur's note*. The draft definitions submitted by Colombia have been amended to reflect the definitions used in the 1988 Convention, with the words "proceeds or instrumentalities of an offence" added to the definition of "confiscation", as proposed by Colombia.]

(i) "Predicate offence" means any crime or offence as a result of which proceeds have been generated that may become the subject of an offence as defined in article 4 of this Convention;

(j) "Controlled delivery" means the technique of allowing illicit or suspect consignments [of ...] to pass out of, through or into the territory of one or more countries, with the knowledge and under the supervision of their competent authorities, with a view to identifying persons involved in the commission of an offence established in article(s) [...] [of an offence covered by this Convention];

[(k) "Financial institution" means any credit establishment, insurance and bonding company, general bonded warehouse, financial leasing company, savings and loan institution, finance company with limited objectives, credit union, financial factoring company, stockbroking firm or other securities dealer, currency exchange bureau, pension fund administrator or other financial or currency broker.][26]

Article 3[27]

[Criminalization of] participation in an [organized criminal group][28]

1. Each State Party shall[29] establish as criminal offences[30] the following conduct:

(a) Organizing, directing, aiding, abetting, facilitating or counselling the commission of serious crime[31] involving an organized criminal group;[32] and [, subject to the fundamental principles of its domestic legal system.][33]

---

[26] The definition of "financial institution" is based on a proposal submitted by Mexico at the first session (see A/AC.254/L.7). It was not discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee at that session.

[27] The delegation of Japan provided a written proposal on this article (A/AC.254/5/Add.4), which was supported by several delegations. The primary points of difference are noted in the text below in brackets. The Chairman indicated that informal consultations would be conducted on the possibility of integrating the proposal into the present text.

The delegation of Colombia submitted the following proposal for the contents of this article:

"1. Each State Party shall establish as a crime or, if already established, shall punish with a more severe penalty the organizing, directing, aiding, abetting, facilitating, counselling or instigating the commission of a serious crime in which an organized group with a transnational character participates.

"2. States Parties shall make punishable all forms of participation and criminal association for the crimes covered by this Convention.

"3. States Parties shall make punishable acts committed intentionally and acts that by their nature lend themselves to serious negligence."

[28] Some delegations proposed the insertion of "transnational" into the title of this article.

[29] Some delegations proposed the insertion of a reference to the establishment of the offences "in accordance with the fundamental legal principles of its domestic legal system". Other delegations regarded this as unnecessary. Some delegations proposed that a general paragraph applicable to all the articles in the Convention be drafted, noting that all measures taken by the States Parties should be in accordance with their fundamental legal principles.

[30] Some delegations proposed that this criminalization obligation extend to the setting of a punishment latitude that took into consideration the seriousness of the offence.

[31] Some delegations proposed that both subparagraphs 1 (a) and (b) refer to serious offences "covered by the present Convention". One delegation proposed that the article apply only to deliberate offences and not to offences committed through negligence.

[32] One delegation noted that organizing, abetting and so on were forms of participation in an offence and were generally not regarded as criminal offences in themselves.

[33] Proposal of the delegation of Japan (A/AC.254/5/Add.4).

(b) Either or both of the following as criminal offences distinct from those involving the attempt or completion of the criminal activity:

(i) Agreeing with one or more other persons to commit[34] a serious crime [involving an organized criminal group][35] for any purpose relating directly or indirectly to the obtaining of a financial or other material benefit[36] and, where required by domestic law, involving an act undertaken by one of the participants in furtherance of the agreement;

(ii) Conduct by a person who intentionally, and with knowledge of either the aim and general criminal activity of an organized criminal group or its intention to commit[37] the crimes in question, takes active part in:

a. Criminal activities of an organized criminal group referred to in article 2 *bis* of this Convention;[38]

b. Other activities of the group in the knowledge that the person's participation will contribute to the achievement of the above-described criminal aim;

[(iii) Participation in acts of an organized criminal group that has the aim of committing a serious crime, in the knowledge that the person's participation will contribute to the achievement of the crime.][39]

2. The knowledge, intent, aim, purpose or agreement referred to in paragraph 1 of this article may be inferred from objective factual circumstances.[40]

[34] One delegation proposed that the word "commit" be replaced with "plan or commit".

[35] Proposal of the delegation of Japan (A/AC.254/5/Add.4).

[36] Some delegations noted also in this connection that the phrase "financial or other material benefit" was too limited. Two delegations proposed to insert the words "or to any other purpose".

[37] One delegation proposed that the word "commit" be replaced with "plan or commit".

[38] One delegation proposed that the phrase "referred to in article 2 *bis* of this Convention" be deleted as unnecessary.

[39] Proposal of the delegation of Japan (A/AC.254/5/Add.4).

[40] One delegation proposed that this paragraph be deleted, on the ground that its substance fell within the purview of the courts. Another delegation proposed that this paragraph be moved to article 6.

Article 4
Money-laundering

1. Each State Party shall adopt such legislative and other measures as may be necessary to establish as offences under its domestic law, [when committed intentionally][41] [and subject to its constitutional principles and basic concepts of its legal system]:[42, 43]

(a) The conversion or transfer of property, knowing that such property is the proceeds of crime,[44] for the purpose of concealing or disguising [or preventing the discovery of][45] the illicit origin of the property or of helping any person who is involved in the commission of the predicate offence[46] to evade the legal consequences of his or her action;

(b) The concealment or disguise [or prevention of the discovery][47] of the true nature, source, location, disposition, movement or ownership of or rights with respect to property, knowing that such property is the proceeds of crime;

---

[41] At the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee, there was extensive discussion on the formulation of paragraph 1, which would require States Parties to criminalize certain acts when committed intentionally, and of paragraph 3, which would suggest that States Parties might, as an option, criminalize certain acts when committed through negligence. Several delegations underlined the need to review those formulations, in particular whether the phrase "when committed intentionally" was needed in paragraph 1 (see also the footnote to paragraph 3).

[42] Some delegations suggested that paragraph 1 provided an adequate definition of the offence of money-laundering. Other delegations suggested that a definition could be inserted in article 2 *bis*. Some delegations expressed caution, stating that, if such a separate definition was provided, it should be in line with paragraph 1 of the article. Some delegations suggested that the following definition, provided by Mexico in article 5 of the draft Protocol on Money-Laundering Supplementary to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (A/AC.254/L.23) could be inserted in article 2 *bis*:

> "'Money-laundering' means any act carried out directly or through an intermediary with a view to the acquisition, disposal, administration, safe keeping, exchange, deposit, guaranteeing, investment, transport, possession, granting or transfer of funds, rights or property of any kind, knowing that such funds, rights or property are derived from, or represent the proceeds of, crime, for the purpose of concealing, disguising or preventing the discovery of the illicit origin thereof or of assisting any person who is involved in the commission of the predicate offence to evade the legal consequences of his or her actions."

[43] Some delegations suggested that the phrase "and subject to its constitutional principles and basic concepts of its legal system" should apply to all of paragraph 1, while other delegations suggested that, in line with the 1988 Convention and the 1990 Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime, the phrase should follow subparagraph (b) and thus apply only to subparagraph (c) and any subsequent subparagraphs.

[44] Some delegations suggested that the concept of "proceeds of crime" should be clarified in this connection. There should also be clarification in respect of the extent of the knowledge of the offender required under this subparagraph, that is, whether it would require that the offender knew only that the proceeds were the result of a certain activity or that the offender also knew that the activity was a crime. The issue of dual criminality would also arise in that connection.

[45] Addition proposed by the delegation of India at the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[46] Some delegations emphasized that the scope of predicate offences required consideration. Other delegations noted that the definition of "predicate offence" provided in subparagraph (i) of article 2 *bis* and the definition of "proceeds of crime" provided in subparagraph (f) of article 2 *bis* might require clarification in this respect.

[47] Addition proposed by the delegation of India at the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

(c) The acquisition, possession or use [disposal, administration, safe keeping, exchange, guaranteeing, investment, transfer or transport][48] of property, knowing, at the time of receipt [or subsequently],[49] that such property is the proceeds of crime;

(d) Participation in, association with or conspiracy to commit, attempts to commit and aiding, abetting, facilitating and counselling the commission of any of the offences established in accordance with this article;

[(e) Engaging in conduct that would constitute an offence under subparagraph 1 (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this article, had the property been derived from [*insert a description of the type of predicate offences governed by this article*], where a law enforcement official or a person acting at his or her direction represented the property to be so derived.][50]

[1 *bis*. Notwithstanding paragraph[s] 1 [and 2 (a)] of this article, where a State Party considers the laundering of the proceeds of a type of offence generally not to arise from or be associated with the activities of organized criminal groups, the State Party shall not be required to establish the laundering of the proceeds of such offence as a criminal offence under its domestic law. The State Party shall periodically review its domestic law with a view to expanding the applicability of laws against money-laundering to the extent required to combat organized criminal groups effectively.][51]

2. For the purposes of implementing or applying paragraph 1 of this article:

(a) It shall not matter whether the predicate offence was subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the State Party;[52]

[(b) It may be provided that the offences set forth in that paragraph do not apply to the persons who committed the predicate offence;][53]

(c) Knowledge, intent or purpose required as an element of an offence set forth in that paragraph may be inferred from objective factual circumstances.[54]

3. Each State Party may adopt such measures as it considers necessary to establish also as offences under its domestic law all or some of the acts referred to in paragraph 1 of this article, in any or all of the following cases:

---

[48] Addition proposed by the delegation of India at the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[49] The words "or subsequently" raise the issue of the right of persons who acquired such property in good faith and the provision should be revised to protect the legitimate rights of such bona fide persons. One delegation proposed that this be amended to read "or subsequently, after it has been established whether or not such persons acted bona fide".

[50] Addition proposed by the United States of America (A/AC.254/L.24). Several delegations noted that both subparagraph (e) of paragraph 1 and paragraph 1 *bis* required further study. Some delegations suggested that subparagraph (e) could be transferred to article 15 (Special investigative techniques). Some delegations expressed reservations about whether the present wording could be interpreted to provide excessive discretion to law enforcement authorities.

[51] Addition proposed by the United States (A/AC.254/L.24).

[52] Some delegations noted that, in connection with this subparagraph, the question of dual criminality should be addressed, as should the scope of application.

[53] Some delegations suggested that this subparagraph be deleted. Other delegations supported its retention, in particular in view of the parallel wording in the 1990 Council of Europe Convention.

[54] Option 2 of this subparagraph was deleted. This option had contained wording regarding the reversal of the burden of proof. Many delegations at the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee suggested that the reversal of the burden of proof, while unacceptable in respect of the presumption of innocence and thus as a basis for conviction, could be used after the offender had been convicted, in considering the question of confiscation of proceeds. This issue is dealt with in paragraph 7 of article 7 (Confiscation).

(a) Where the offender ought to have assumed that the property was the proceeds of crime;

(b) Where the offender acted for the purpose of making a profit; or

(c) Where the offender acted for the purpose of promoting the perpetration of further criminal activity.[55]

[Subparagraphs of old paragraph 4 moved or deleted][56]

[Old paragraph 5 moved to article 4 bis]

4. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the principle that the description of the offences to which it refers and of legal defences thereto is reserved to the domestic law of a State Party and that such offences shall be prosecuted and punished in conformity with that law.

Article 4 bis
Measures to combat money-laundering

Option 1

1. Each State Party shall institute a domestic regulatory regime for financial institutions[57] doing business within its jurisdiction to deter and detect money-laundering. Such regimes shall include the following minimum requirements:

(a) The licensing and periodic examination of such institutions;

(b) The lifting of bank secrecy in cases involving measures for the prevention and investigation of the crime of money-laundering, in accordance with the precepts laid down in the domestic legislation of each State Party;

(c) The making and retaining by such institutions of clear and complete records of accounts and transactions at, by or through the institution for at least five years and ensuring that those records are available to appropriate authorities for use in criminal investigations, prosecutions and regulatory or administrative investigations and proceedings;

---

[55] Some delegations suggested that this paragraph required considerable clarification. Other delegations suggested that the phrase "ought to have assumed that the property was the proceeds of crime" could be replaced, for example, with the words "should have assumed that the property was the proceeds of crime" or "acted in violation of his or her duty to act", or that the paragraph could state only as follows: "Each State Party may adopt such measures as it considers necessary to establish also as offences under its domestic law all or some of the acts referred to in paragraph 1 of this article, when committed through negligence." It was also suggested that the concept of negligence should be defined in this connection. Some delegations noted that the words "acted for the purpose of making a profit" and "acted for the purpose of promoting the perpetration of further criminal activity" referred to aggravating factors that were not at all connected with the concept of negligence otherwise covered by this paragraph and suggested that they be placed in a separate paragraph.

[56] Old subparagraph 4 (a) was covered by paragraph 7 of article 7. Some delegations objected to old subparagraph 4 (b) on the grounds that it was in conflict with fundamental principles of justice, including the rights of bona fide third parties. Old subparagraph 4 (c) also raised problems vis-à-vis the rights of bona fide third parties. Old subparagraph 4 (d), on the level of punishment, was deleted on the grounds that it only referred to one sentencing option, fines, and that other factors also should be considered in sentencing.

[57] The term "financial institutions" includes, at a minimum, banks, other depository institutions and appropriate non-bank providers of financial services (such as securities dealers or brokers, commodity or futures dealers or brokers, currency dealers or exchangers, fund transmitters and casinos).

(d) Ensuring the availability to law enforcement, regulatory and administrative authorities of information held by such institutions on the identity of clients and beneficial owners of accounts; to this end, States Parties shall prohibit financial institutions from offering accounts identified only by number, anonymous accounts or accounts in false names; and

(e) Requiring such institutions to report suspicious or unusual transactions.

[1 *bis*. States Parties shall adopt appropriate measures to apply instruments with regard to money-laundering to banking and non-banking financial institutions, and financial markets, including stock exchanges, *bureaux de change*, etc.][58]

2. States Parties shall examine their domestic regimes relating to the establishment of business organizations and shall consider whether additional measures are required to prevent the use of such entities to facilitate money-laundering activities.

3. States Parties shall consider implementing feasible measures to detect and monitor the movement of cash and appropriate negotiable instruments across their borders, subject to safeguards to ensure proper use of information and without impeding in any way the freedom of legitimate capital movements. The measures may include a requirement that individuals and businesses report cross-border transfers of substantial quantities of cash and appropriate negotiable instruments.

4. States Parties shall enhance their ability to exchange information collected pursuant to this article. This shall, where possible, include measures to enhance domestic and international exchange of information between law enforcement and regulatory authorities. To this end, States Parties shall consider the establishment of financial intelligence units to serve as national centres for the collection, analysis and dissemination of information regarding potential money-laundering and other financial crimes.

5. In establishing regimes to combat money-laundering, States Parties should consider, in particular, the forty recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, as well as other relevant initiatives against money-laundering endorsed by the Organization of American States, the European Union, the Council of Europe and the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force.

6. States Parties shall endeavour to develop and promote global, regional, subregional and bilateral cooperation among judicial, law enforcement and financial regulatory authorities in order to combat money-laundering.

Option 2[59]

1. Each State Party shall:

(a) Institute a comprehensive domestic regulatory and supervisory regime for banks and non-bank financial institutions, and other bodies particularly susceptible to money-laundering, within its competence, in order to deter and detect all forms of

[58] Paragraph 1 *bis* was submitted by the delegation of India as a reformulation of both options of old paragraph 5 of article 4.

[59] Option 2 is a proposal submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/AC.254/5/Add.6). The proposal was preliminarily discussed at the third session and received widespread support as the basis for further work on this article.

money-laundering, which regime shall emphasize requirements for customer identification, record-keeping and the reporting of suspicious transactions;

(b) Without prejudice to articles [14 and 19] of this Convention, ensure that administrative, regulatory, law enforcement and other authorities dedicated to combating money-laundering (including, where appropriate under domestic law, judicial authorities) have the ability to cooperate and exchange information at the national and international levels [within the conditions prescribed by its domestic legislation[60]].

2. For the purposes of implementing and applying the provisions of this article [4 and 4 *bis*], States Parties shall adopt and adhere to the international standards set by the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering established by the Heads of State or Government of the seven major industrialized countries and the President of the European Commission as set out for reference in annex [...] to this Convention and as endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution S-20/4 of 10 June 1998 on countering money-laundering.[61]

[3. With respect to the monitoring of implementation by States Parties of the obligations set forth in this article [4 and 4 *bis*], and without prejudice to the application of article [23] to other provisions of this Convention, a State Party shall be deemed to be in compliance with article [23] if that State Party is subject to and participates in a regular process of peer review conducted by the Financial Action Task Force or other comparable regional body that assesses implementation of regimes against money-laundering as set forth in this article.][62]

Article 4 ter
Measures against corruption

1. This Convention shall apply to the offences of corruption [described in this article], when involving an organized criminal group.[63]

2. Each State Party shall adopt such legislative and other measures as may be necessary to establish as criminal offences the following conduct, when committed intentionally[64] [and involving an organized criminal group]:[65]

---

[60] The delegation of the United Kingdom noted that this phrase might accommodate the concerns of delegations that might have a preference for references to domestic legislation in this subparagraph (as in articles 14 and 19), but the delegation itself would not wish to see these included in the final version of the article.

[61] Some delegations expressed concern about the appropriateness of incorporating in a global instrument standards set by a group of States with limited membership. Furthermore, discussion revolved around the inherently optional nature of these recommendations and whether it was compatible with the obligatory language of this paragraph. While it was recognized that the international community should seek to set high standards for measures to combat money-laundering, or at least benefit from already existing standards that had received broad recognition, the matter required further discussion.

[62] Depending upon the outcome of negotiations on article 23, this paragraph may require modification. Some delegations expressed serious concerns about the implications and feasibility of this paragraph.

[63] Some delegations wished to ensure that the obligations in this article were subject to the fundamental principles of their legal systems, as set forth in article 6, paragraph 2, of document A/AC.254/4/Rev.3. A number of delegations suggested that this paragraph should be deleted.

[64] One delegation wished to delete the mental element.

[65] Some delegations felt that a transnational aspect could be included. Others felt that this might restrict the scope of the obligation so as to make it of more limited value in fighting organized crime.

(a) The [promise,] offering or giving to a public official,[66] directly or indirectly, of an undue advantage,[67] for the official himself or another person or entity, in exchange for acting or refraining from acting in the exercise of his official duties;

(b) The solicitation or acceptance by a public official, directly or indirectly, of an undue advantage, for the official himself or another person or entity, in exchange for acting or refraining from acting in the exercise of his official duties.[68]

[3. Any State Party that has not yet done so shall, in conformity with its international obligations, take measures to make punishable conduct referred to in paragraph 2 of this article involving:

(a) A foreign public official;

(b) An international civil servant;

(c) A judge or official of an international court.][69]

4. Each State Party shall also take such measures as may be necessary to establish as criminal offences the participation as an accomplice[70] in an offence established in accordance with this article [and conspiracy to commit or criminal association with respect to such offence].[71]

4 *bis*. Each State Party shall consider adopting such legislative and other measures as may be necessary to establish as criminal offences other forms of corruption, when committed intentionally [and involving an organized criminal group].[72]

---

[66] See the footnote to paragraph 6.

[67] Some delegations felt that this term should be more concrete. The delegation of India proposed that it be replaced with the words "any gratification other than legal remuneration". The delegation of Venezuela proposed that the words "undue advantage" be replaced with the words "undue advantage or other type of advantage".

[68] The delegation of Uruguay proposed the reinsertion of the following text from document A/AC.254/4/Rev.3:

"An act of corruption in the public sphere committed within the framework of organized crime in order to facilitate such criminal activities shall be considered an aggravating factor.

"A State Party that has not yet adopted the legal measures necessary for consideration in its domestic law of an act of corruption as an aggravating factor, as referred to in paragraph [...], shall do so."

[69] Some delegations felt that the conduct described in this paragraph should not be included in this article, in particular in view of the possibility of including such offences in a future instrument on corruption. Other delegations felt that this paragraph raised concerns about privileges and immunities accorded by international instruments to some of the officials described in this paragraph. Some delegations, including Belgium, considered this paragraph essential for the fight against corruption, particularly in the context of the fight against transnational organized crime.

Some delegations proposed the deletion of this paragraph.

[70] This term is derived from the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and is intended to ensure that aiding of the crime is punished. It will be necessary to harmonize this provision with the corresponding provision in article 4.

[71] Further consideration could be given to including the concept described in the bracketed text (and the corresponding provision in article 4) in article 3 rather than in this article.

[72] This paragraph would address the concerns of some delegations that the criminalization of other forms of corruption should not be precluded. The potential additional instrument on corruption could also regulate this area more precisely.

5. Each State Party shall:

(a) To the extent appropriate and consistent with its legal system, adopt legislative, administrative or other effective measures to promote integrity[73] and to prevent and detect corruption of public officials[74] [; and]

[(b) If it has not already done so, establish and maintain domestic authorities [with sufficient independence and appropriate resources] for the purpose of ensuring effective prevention and detection of corruption among public officials.][75, 76]

6. For the purposes of this article, a public official is [*insert definition*].[77]

Article 5[78]
Liability of legal persons

1. Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary, consistent with its legal principles,[79] to establish the liability of legal persons for participation in serious crimes involving an organized criminal group and for the offences established in articles 3 and 4 of this Convention.[80]

2. Subject to the legal principles of the State Party, the liability of legal persons may be criminal, civil or administrative.

3. Such liability shall be incurred without prejudice to the criminal liability of the natural persons who have committed the offences.

---

[73] This phrase was inserted in order to refer to preventive measures contained in regional anti-corruption instruments.

[74] Some delegations were of the view that an indication of the measures to be taken should be included, along the lines of article 4 *bis*, on measures against money-laundering. They suggested that for that purpose the proposal of Mexico contained in document A/AC.254/L.39 could be used. The view was expressed that the substance of those proposals would be of value in the formulation of an independent international instrument against corruption.

[75] A number of delegations felt that this paragraph could be inserted in other portions of the Convention. More detailed provisions could be included in a future additional instrument addressing corruption.

[76] Several delegations suggested that subparagraph (b) should be deleted, since the concept was covered by subparagraph (a). The delegation of Venezuela proposed that the two subparagraphs be merged, as follows:

"States Parties shall, as appropriate, establish and maintain domestic authorities in order to ensure the effective prevention and detection of corruption among public officials and shall adopt effective legislative, administrative or other measures in order to promote integrity and in order to prevent and detect corruption among public officials."

Some delegations noted that, if the words "with sufficient independence and appropriate resources" were deleted, then the word "independent" should be inserted before the words "domestic authorities".

[77] A number of delegations felt that, in any case, the definition should include the list contained in paragraph 4 of document A/AC.254/L.29, that is, "judicial official, juror or lay judge, police official, border control and customs official, investigator, prosecutor or other official with criminal law enforcement responsibilities in the State Party concerned". Other delegations supported the inclusion of other persons acting in an official capacity.

The delegation of India proposed the definition "any person in the service or pay of the Government or remunerated by the Government by fees or commission for the performance of any public duty".

[78] The formulation of this article, subject to the footnotes to paragraph 1, received broad support at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[79] Consistency in the wording of clauses referring to legal principles throughout the Convention will need to be addressed at a later stage.

[80] The formulation in this paragraph should be consistent with the scope described in article 2, paragraph 1.

4. Each State Party shall, in particular, ensure that legal persons held liable in accordance with this article are subject to effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal or non-criminal sanctions, including monetary sanctions.

Article 6

Prosecution, adjudication and sanctions[81, 82, 83]

1. Each State Party shall make the commission of an offence covered by this Convention[84] liable to sanctions that take into account the grave nature of those offences.

2. Each State Party shall endeavour to ensure that any discretionary legal powers under its domestic law relating to the prosecution of persons for offences that are covered by this Convention are exercised to maximize the effectiveness of law enforcement measures in respect of those offences and with due regard to the need to deter the commission of such offences.

[3. Each State Party shall ensure that its courts or other competent authorities bear in mind the grave nature of the offences that are covered by this Convention when considering the [eventuality] [possibility] of early release or parole of persons convicted of such offences.][85]

4. Each State Party shall, where appropriate, establish under its domestic law a long statute of limitations period in which to commence proceedings for any offence

---

[81] One delegation emphasized the need for provisions on procedural safeguards.

[82] Paragraphs 1-3 of this article, as they appeared in document A/AC.254/4/Rev.3, have been combined as follows and are to be moved to a new article 23 *ter*:

"1. Each State Party shall take the necessary measures, including legislative and administrative measures, in accordance with the fundamental principles of its domestic legal system, to ensure the implementation of its obligations under this Convention.

"2. Each State Party may adopt more strict or severe measures than those provided for by the Convention for the prevention and control of transnational organized crime."

[83] Many delegations expressed concerns about the following text, which was paragraph 4 of article 6 (see A/AC.254/4/Rev.3):

"Each State Party shall take effective measures to ensure that its territory, or any facility therein, is not allowed to be used by an organized criminal group, or a member thereof, to plan or perpetrate any crime covered by this Convention in any other country."

The Chairman suggested that the text be either clarified and redrafted or deleted.

The delegation of India supported the retention of the paragraph and proposed the following formulation:

"Each State Party shall adopt legislative and other measures, as may be necessary, to establish as criminal offences the conduct constituting the perpetration of any crime covered by this Convention from its own territory in the territory of any other State by an organized criminal group or a member thereof."

This formulation was supported by some other delegations. Some other delegations wished to discuss further the proposal and its placement in the draft Convention.

[84] The use of the phrase "an offence covered by this Convention" should be reviewed once the scope of the Convention has been determined.

[85] Several delegations expressed concern about this paragraph because, under their legal systems, early release on parole might depend on factors other than the seriousness of the offence. Other delegations noted that their legal systems did not foresee the possibility of early release. It was suggested that this paragraph might have to be redrafted in less obligatory terms.

covered by this Convention and a longer period where the alleged offender has evaded the administration of justice.[86]

[5. In the case of offences established in accordance with articles [...] of this Convention, each State Party shall take appropriate measures, [consistent with its legal system,] with due regard to the rights of the defence, to seek to ensure that conditions imposed in connection with decisions on release pending trial or appeal take into consideration the need to ensure the presence of the defendant at subsequent criminal proceedings.][87]

Article 7
Confiscation

1. States Parties shall adopt such measures as may be necessary to enable confiscation of:

(a) Proceeds of crime[88] or property the value of which corresponds[89] to that of such proceeds;

(b) Property, equipment or other instrumentalities used in or intended for use[90] in offences covered by this Convention.

2. States Parties shall adopt such measures as may be necessary to enable the identification, freezing or seizure of any item referred to in paragraph 1 of this article for the purpose of eventual confiscation.

3. For the purposes of this article and article 7 *bis*, each State Party shall empower its courts or other competent authorities to order that bank, financial or commercial records be made available or be seized. A State Party shall not decline to act under the provisions of this paragraph on the ground of bank secrecy.

4. If proceeds of crime have been transformed or converted into other property, such property shall be liable to the measures referred to in this article instead of the proceeds.

5. If proceeds of crime have been intermingled with property acquired from legitimate sources,[91] such property shall, without prejudice to any powers relating to seizure or freezing, be liable to confiscation up to the assessed value of the intermingled proceeds.

---

[86] This paragraph is based on article 3, paragraph 8, of the 1988 Convention. Some delegations proposed its deletion. Several other delegations supported its retention. In addition, one delegation proposed the deletion of the words "where appropriate" on the ground that the draft Convention applied only to serious crime and the words would unnecessarily weaken the obligation. Another delegation proposed that the paragraph end with the words "this Convention", with the subsequent text deleted.

[87] This paragraph is a revision of paragraph 11 of article 6 (see A/AC.254/4/Rev.3) proposed by the delegation of Finland at the request of the Chairman. It was not discussed at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[88] The scope of this article is under debate. It was suggested that because of variations in domestic legal systems in this area, it might be difficult for some countries to conform to an overly broad obligation. It was emphasized, however, that there would be a need for flexibility in finalizing this article.

[89] Some delegations indicated that the issue of corresponding value created difficulties.

[90] One delegation expressed concern about the inclusion of the words "or intended for use".

[91] One delegation noted the need to safeguard the rights of the family of the offender in considering confiscation of intermingled property.

6. Income or other benefits derived from proceeds of crime, from property into which proceeds of crime have been transformed or converted or from property with which proceeds of crime have been intermingled shall also be liable to the measures referred to in this article, in the same manner and to the same extent as proceeds of crime.

7. Each State Party may consider the possibility of requiring that a convicted offender demonstrate the lawful origin of alleged proceeds of crime or other property liable to confiscation, to the extent that such a requirement is consistent with the principles of its domestic law and with the nature of the judicial and other proceedings.[92]

8. The provisions of this article shall not be construed to prejudice the rights of bona fide third parties.

Article 7 bis

International cooperation for purposes of confiscation

1. Following a request[93] made pursuant to this article by another State Party having jurisdiction over an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: over an offence covered by this Convention], the State Party in whose territory proceeds of crime, property, instrumentalities or any other things referred to in paragraph 1 of article 7 are situated shall:

(a) Submit the request to its competent authorities for the purpose of obtaining an order of confiscation and, if such order is granted, give effect to it; or

(b) Submit to its competent authorities, with a view to giving effect to it to the extent requested, an order of confiscation issued by the requesting Party in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article, insofar as it relates to proceeds of crime, property, instrumentalities or any other things referred to in paragraph 1 of article 7 situated in the territory of the requested Party.

2. Following a request made pursuant to this article by another State Party having jurisdiction over an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: over an offence covered by this Convention], the requested State Party shall take measures to identify, trace and freeze or seize proceeds of crime, property, instrumentalities or any other things referred to in paragraph 1 of article 7 for the purpose of eventual confiscation to be ordered either by the requesting State Party or, pursuant to a request under paragraph 1 of this article, by the requested State Party.

3. The decisions or actions provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article shall be taken by the requested State Party, in accordance with and subject to the provisions of its domestic law and its procedural rules or any bilateral or multilateral treaty, agreement or arrangement to which it may be bound in relation to the requesting State Party.

4. The provisions of article 14 are applicable *mutatis mutandis*. In addition to the information specified in paragraph 10 of article 14, requests made pursuant to this article shall contain the following:

(a) In the case of a request pertaining to subparagraph 1 (a) of this article, a description of the property to be confiscated and a statement of the facts relied upon by the

[92] This paragraph was reformulated at the suggestion of the Chairman in order to take into consideration concerns expressed by many delegations.

[93] Some delegations indicated that they required an official court request for purposes of confiscation.

requesting State Party sufficient to enable the requested State Party to seek the order under its domestic law;

(b) In the case of a request pertaining to subparagraph 1 (b) of this article, a legally admissible copy of an order of confiscation issued by the requesting State Party upon which the request is based, a statement of the facts and information as to the extent to which the execution of the order is requested;

(c) In the case of a request pertaining to paragraph 2 of this article, a statement of the facts relied upon by the requesting State Party and a description of the actions requested.

5. Each State Party shall furnish the Secretary-General with the text of any of its laws and regulations that give effect to this paragraph and the text of any subsequent changes to such laws and regulations.

6. If a State Party elects to make the taking of the measures referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article conditional on the existence of a relevant treaty, that Party shall consider this Convention the necessary and sufficient treaty basis.

7. States Parties shall seek to conclude bilateral and multilateral treaties, agreements or arrangements to enhance the effectiveness of international cooperation pursuant to this article.

8. Cooperation under this article may be refused by a State Party if the offence to which the request relates would not be an offence in the context of a criminal organization if committed within its jurisdiction.[94]

9. The provisions of this article shall not be construed to prejudice the rights of bona fide third parties.

Article 7 ter
Disposal of confiscated assets

1. Proceeds of crime or property confiscated by a State Party pursuant to paragraph 1 of article 7 or paragraph 1 of article 7 *bis* shall be disposed of by that State Party according to its domestic law and administrative procedures.

2. When acting on the request of another State Party in accordance with this article, a State Party may give special consideration to concluding agreements on:

(a) Contributing the value of such proceeds and property, or funds derived from the sale of such proceeds or property or a substantial part thereof to intergovernmental bodies specializing in the fight against organized crime;

(b) Sharing with other States Parties, on a regular or case-by-case basis, such proceeds or property, or funds derived from the sale of such proceeds or property, in accordance with its domestic law, administrative procedures or bilateral or multilateral agreements entered into for this purpose.

[94] One delegation suggested that this paragraph should be clarified in respect of the phrase "an offence in the context of a criminal organization". Another delegation noted the need for further specification of grounds for refusal.

[*Article 8 was deleted as it will be superseded by either option 1 or option 2 of article 4* bis.]

Article 9[95]
Jurisdiction

1. Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences established in article(s) [...][96] of this Convention when:

(a) The offence is committed in the territory of that State; or

(b) The offence is committed on board a vessel that is flying the flag of that State or an aircraft that is registered under the laws of that State at the time the offence is committed.

2. A State Party may also establish its jurisdiction over any such offence when:

(a) The offence is committed against a national or a habitual resident of that State;[97]

(b) The offence is committed by a national or a habitual resident of that State; or

(c) The offence is committed outside its territory with a view to the commission, within its territory, of an offence established in accordance with articles [...] of this Convention; or

[(d) The offence has substantial effects in that State.][98]

[3. Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences it has established in accordance with articles [...] of this Convention when the alleged offender is present in its territory and it does not extradite him or her to another State Party on the ground:

(a) That the offence has been committed in its territory or on board a vessel that was flying its flag or an aircraft that was registered under its law at the time the offence was committed; or

(b) That the offence has been committed by one of its nationals.][99]

[4. Each State Party may also take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences it has established in accordance with articles [...] when the alleged offender is present in its territory and it does not extradite him or her.][100]

5. If the State exercising its jurisdiction under paragraph 1 or 2 of this article has been notified, or has otherwise learned, that one or more other States are conducting an investigation or carrying out criminal proceedings in respect of the same conduct, the

[95] The text of this article is based on a proposal submitted by Poland at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee (see A/AC.254/5/Add.7).

[96] Reference would be made here to all the articles of the Convention containing an obligation to criminalize certain conduct.

[97] The delegation of China proposed the inclusion of the words "or that State" at the end of the sentence. Some other delegations suggested that the concept of an "offence committed against a State" was ambiguous and would in any case be covered by paragraph 6 of the present article.

[98] This subparagraph was included in the previous version of this article (see A/AC.254/4/Rev.3) and was retained at the request of some delegations.

[99] The text of this paragraph will need to be reviewed in the light of agreement on the formulation of article 10, on extradition.

[100] The text of this paragraph will need to be reviewed in the light of agreement on the formulation of article 10, on extradition.

competent authorities of those States shall, as appropriate, consult one another with a view to resolving the matter and coordinating their actions. [Until a solution has been reached, each State Party shall take care, as far as possible, not to jeopardize the investigations conducted by one or more States.][101]

6. This Convention does not exclude the exercise of any criminal jurisdiction established by a State Party in accordance with its domestic law.[102]

7. The provisions of this article shall not affect the obligations with regard to the establishment of jurisdiction over offences pursuant to any other international treaty.

---

[101] It was agreed to review this sentence in the light of article 14, on mutual legal assistance, to be agreed upon. The Islamic Republic of Iran proposed that a compromise solution might be the following: "with a view to coordinating their investigative actions, so as not to lose time-sensitive evidence". Some delegations expressed their preference for the previous formulation of this paragraph, as contained in document A/AC.254/4/Rev.3.

[102] In the extensive discussion on this paragraph at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee, several delegations noted that this paragraph could be understood to allow States Parties to apply their domestic laws to the territory of other States, for example, to carry out investigative measures abroad. Mexico, supported by several delegations, therefore proposed that the paragraph be clarified by adding the following sentence: "This Convention does not allow extraterritorial application of domestic legislation." Mexico also referred to the text of article 2, paragraph 4, of the present draft, which would prohibit States Parties from undertaking in the territory of another State the exercise of jurisdiction and the performance of functions reserved exclusively for the authorities of that other State by its domestic law.

Several other delegations pointed out that the paragraph was identical to article 4, paragraph 3, of the 1988 Convention. Its purpose was understood by those delegations to allow States Parties to establish jurisdiction, on which basis they could, for example, then proceed to request mutual legal assistance under article 14, which is in accordance with international law and practice. Those delegations suggested that the proposal of Mexico could itself be misunderstood as prohibiting, in contradiction to the provision in paragraph 2 of the present draft, States Parties from applying domestic law to offences committed abroad by, for example, their own nationals. It was also pointed out that article 2, paragraph 3, of the present draft emphasized the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and that those principles applied also to any exercise of jurisdiction. The Netherlands pointed out that the issue was explicitly addressed in the comments on article 4, paragraph 3, of the 1988 Convention contained in the commentary on that convention (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.98.XI.5).

Three proposals were made to address the concerns of the first group of countries.

Norway proposed amending the end of paragraph 6 to read "in accordance with its domestic law and with international law".

Finland proposed amending paragraph 6 to read:

"6. This Convention does not exclude the establishment of any criminal jurisdiction by a State Party in accordance with its domestic law."

Venezuela proposed that a cross-reference be inserted in paragraph 6 of article 9 to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 2 of the present draft.

The Chairman noted that at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee none of the proposals had sufficiently broad support to serve as the basis for consensus and that the issue should be kept under review.

Article 10
Extradition[103]

1. This article shall apply to the offences covered by this Convention [offences established in article(s) ...].[104]

2. Each of the offences to which this article applies shall be deemed to be included as an extraditable offence in any extradition treaty existing between States Parties. The Parties undertake to include such offences as extraditable offences in every extradition treaty to be concluded between them.[105]

3. If a State Party that makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty receives a request for extradition from another Party with which it has no extradition treaty, it [shall][106] [may] consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition in respect of any offence to which this article applies. Parties that require detailed legislation in order to use this Convention as a legal basis for extradition shall consider enacting such legislation as may be necessary.

4. States Parties that do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall recognize offences to which this article applies as extraditable offences between themselves.

5. Extradition shall be subject to the conditions provided for by the law of the requested State Party or by applicable extradition treaties, including the grounds upon which the requested Party may refuse extradition.

6. In considering requests pursuant to this article, the requested State may refuse to comply with such requests where there are substantial grounds leading its judicial or other competent authorities to believe that compliance would facilitate the prosecution or punishment of any person on account of his or her gender, race, religion, nationality or political opinions, or would cause prejudice for any of those reasons to any person affected by the request.[107]

---

[103] This article combines articles 10-13 in document A/AC.254/4 and is based on a proposal submitted by France and Sweden (A/AC.254/5) and resubmitted in an amended form during the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The text in brackets in this article was proposed during the discussion at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

One delegation noted that this article did not sufficiently take into account the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare*, in particular in respect of the establishment of jurisdiction.

One delegation emphasized the importance of ensuring procedural safeguards and suggested that either a separate paragraph should deal with that issue or all relevant paragraphs should refer to "fundamental legal principles".

[104] One delegation proposed that the scope of this article be limited to offences punishable by one year or more of imprisonment.

[105] One delegation noted the need for a paragraph on the application of the principle of double criminality to extradition cases.

[106] One delegation stated that this provision could be mandatory only if the Convention contained provisions outlining a detailed extradition regime.

[107] Some delegations noted that the use of such ambiguous terms as "substantial" or "cause prejudice" in this provision could increase the number of refusals to extradite and suggested that the paragraph should be clarified, for example, by establishing the criteria for the assessment of such issues. Some delegations expressed their preference for the list of grounds for refusal provided in article 10, paragraph 8, option 2, in document A/AC.254/4.

Some delegations suggested that a request for extradition could be refused if the offence in question was punishable by capital punishment in the requesting State. One delegation opposed such a provision and

7. States Parties shall endeavour to expedite extradition procedures and to simplify evidentiary requirements relating thereto in respect of any offence to which this article applies.[108] [States Parties, subject to their domestic legislation, shall consider simplifying extradition of consenting persons who waive formal extradition proceedings, by allowing direct transmission of extradition requests between appropriate ministries.][109]

8. Subject to the provisions of its domestic law and its extradition treaties, the requested State Party may, upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant and are urgent and at the request of the requesting Party, take a person whose extradition is sought and who is present in its territory into custody or take other appropriate measures to ensure his or her presence at extradition proceedings.

9. (a) The State Party in the territory of which the offender or the alleged offender is found shall, in cases where this Convention applies, if it does not extradite that person [for the purpose of prosecution],[110] be obliged, upon request of the State Party seeking extradition, whether or not the offence was committed in its territory, to submit the case without undue delay to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution, [subject to the condition of double criminality,] through proceedings in accordance with the laws of that State.[111] Those authorities shall take their decision in the same manner as in the case of any other offence of a grave nature under the law of that State;[112]

(b) Whenever a State Party is permitted under its domestic law to extradite or otherwise surrender one of its nationals only upon the condition that the person will be returned to that State to serve the sentence imposed as a result of the trial or proceedings for which the extradition or surrender of the person was sought and this State and the State seeking the extradition of the person agree with this option and other terms that they may deem appropriate, such a conditional extradition or surrender shall be sufficient to discharge the obligation set forth in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph.

---

noted that paragraph 5, on the statutory conditions for extradition, would be sufficient.

One delegation noted that the fact that an offender was sentenced *in absentia* should not as such be grounds for refusal if the fundamental legal rights of the defendant had not been violated. That delegation offered to prepare a proposal to that effect.

Regarding paragraph 6, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) recommended in document A/AC.254/L.10 that the wording be amended to "Extradition shall not be granted if, from the circumstances of the case, it can be inferred that persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion is involved ...".

UNHCR further requested that a paragraph be incorporated into the Convention that would prohibit the extradition for the purposes of the Convention in cases of "political offences". UNHCR suggested the following wording: "Extradition shall not be granted if the offence in respect of which it is requested is regarded by the requested Party as a political offence, an offence related thereto, or an ordinary criminal offence prosecuted for political reasons."

One delegation noted that it was prepared to allow such an exception, but not in the case of heinous offences.

[108] Some delegations expressed their concern that this paragraph might lead to violations of the fundamental legal rights of the defendant.

[109] The text in brackets was retained from the original document (A/AC.254/4). The text was omitted in the revised proposal by France and Sweden.

[110] One delegation noted that the element of refusal of extradition solely on the basis of the nationality of the alleged offender should be retained.

[111] Several delegations were of the view that the principle *aut dedere aut judicare* should also be applicable in cases of refusal of extradition because of the existence of the death penalty in the requesting State.

[112] One delegation proposed the deletion of the last sentence of this paragraph.

10. If extradition, sought for purposes of enforcing a sentence, is refused because the person sought is a national of the requested State Party, the requested Party shall, if its law so permits[113] and if it is in conformity with the requirement of such law, upon application of the requesting Party, consider the enforcement of the sentence that has been imposed under the law of the requesting Party or the remainder thereof.

11. Any person regarding whom proceedings are being carried out in connection with any of the offences covered by this Convention shall be guaranteed fair treatment at all stages of the proceedings, including enjoyment of all the rights and guarantees provided by the law of the State in the territory of which that person is present.

12. States Parties shall seek to conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements to carry out or to enhance the effectiveness of extradition.[114]

13. States Parties may consider entering into bilateral or multilateral agreements, either ad hoc or general, on the transfer to their country of persons sentenced to imprisonment or other forms of deprivation of liberty for offences to which this article applies, in order that they may complete their sentences there.

[14. States Parties shall designate an authority, or when necessary authorities,[115] which shall have the responsibility and power to execute requests for extradition or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution. The Secretary-General shall be notified of the authority or authorities designated for this purpose. Transmission of requests for extradition and any communication thereto shall be effected between the authorities designated by the Parties.[116] This requirement shall be without prejudice to the right of a Party to require that such requests and communications be addressed to it through the diplomatic channel.][117]

[*Articles 11, 12 and 13 were merged into new article 10*][118]

---

[113] One delegation noted that this paragraph required clarification as to what procedure should be followed if the law did not regulate the matter.

[114] One delegation suggested that this issue was already covered by paragraphs 3 and 4 and therefore proposed the deletion of this paragraph.

[115] Several delegations noted that this provision was based on the corresponding provision in the 1988 Convention, but that in the latter the provision concerned mutual assistance. They noted that the use of central authorities instead of the diplomatic channels for the purpose of extradition, as well as the designation of several authorities for that purpose, might be problematic.

[116] Several delegations proposed that reference be made to the possibility of using modern means of communication in the transmission of requests. One delegation proposed that, if any provisions were included in the Convention on the consideration of extradition, the corresponding article in the Model Treaty on Extradition (General Assembly resolution 45/116, annex) should be used.

Two delegations proposed that the issue of interim arrest in anticipation of extradition be noted. Another delegation was of the view that the matter was sufficiently well covered in current extradition practice.

[117] Several delegations supported the transfer of this paragraph to the present article from a separate article that had appeared in document A/AC.254/4. Some delegations, however, were of the view that it should be combined with the corresponding provision on central authorities in article 14 (Mutual legal assistance) and be placed in a separate article entitled "Transmission of requests for extradition and mutual assistance", to precede the articles on these issues. One delegation was of the view that this separate article should more generally include provisions that were common to all forms of international judicial cooperation.

[118] On the deletion of article 13, see footnote 117 above.

Article 14
Mutual legal assistance[119]

1. States Parties shall afford one another the widest measure of mutual legal assistance [, within the conditions prescribed by the domestic legislation][120] in investigations,[121] prosecutions and judicial proceedings in relation to the crimes or offences covered by this Convention, as provided for in article 2, paragraph 1.[122]

[1 *bis*. Without prejudice to the other limitations to the obligation to assist set forth in this article, mutual legal assistance also shall be afforded where the requesting State Party is investigating a serious crime and suspects the involvement of an organized criminal group.][123]

[1 *ter*. Each State Party shall, to the fullest extent possible under its relevant laws, treaties and arrangements, provide prompt and effective cooperation to another Party for proceedings brought by a State Party against a legal person under article 5 of this Convention.][124]

[1 *quater*. No State Party shall be entitled to undertake, in the territorial jurisdiction of any other State Party, the performance or discharge of any functions for which the jurisdiction or competence is reserved exclusively for the authorities of that other Party under its domestic laws or regulations.][125]

2. Mutual assistance to be afforded in accordance with this article may be requested for any of the following purposes:[126]

(a) Taking evidence or statements from persons;

(b) Effecting service of judicial documents;

(c) Executing searches, [freezing][127] and seizures;

---

[119] Several delegations proposed that the Model Treaty on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (General Assembly resolution 45/117, annex) be used as the basis for the drafting of this article.

One delegation proposed that the corresponding provisions in the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings be taken as the basis for this article.

[120] Several delegations suggested that this phrase be deleted, on the ground that the concern was adequately met by paragraph 12. One delegation disagreed, noting that paragraph 12 related to a question of procedure.

[121] Some delegations were of the view that, since the concept of "investigations" in paragraph 1 assumed the suspicion of involvement in crime, paragraph 1 *bis* was redundant.

[122] Some delegations preferred a more descriptive formulation of the scope of this paragraph.

[123] See footnote 121 above. One delegation noted that in view of the operational and financial resources to be expended by the requested State, a proper basis must exist before assistance commenced.

[124] This paragraph was inserted on the ground that, according to the laws of some States, legal persons as such could not be suspects or defendants in a criminal case and thus would not otherwise be covered by the present article. Delegations generally supported the idea contained in this paragraph, although some were of the view that it was already covered by paragraph 1. A number of delegations favoured the following alternative formulation:

"Mutual legal assistance shall be afforded with respect to investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings relating to offences for which a legal person may be held liable in the requesting State Party."

[125] This paragraph was proposed by Mexico at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee (see A/AC.254/L.44). The Chairman indicated that it required further consideration.

[126] Belgium suggested that this paragraph should be reformulated in order to ensure that it did not imply that the list of measures was exhaustive. Other delegations supported this suggestion.

[127] Proposal of the delegation of China.

[(c *bis*) The seizure, confiscation and surrender of property;][128]

(d) Examining objects and sites;

(e) Providing information, evidentiary items [and expert evaluations];[129]

(f) Providing originals or certified copies of relevant documents and records, including bank, financial, corporate or business records;[130]

(g) Identifying or tracing proceeds, property, instrumentalities or other things for evidentiary purposes;

(h) Facilitating the appearance of persons in the requesting State Party;

[(h *bis*) Locating or identifying persons or objects;][131]

(i) Any other type of assistance allowed by the law of the requested [or requesting][132] State Party.

2 *bis*. Without prejudice to national law, the competent authorities of a State Party may, without prior request, transmit information relating to criminal matters to a competent authority in another State where they believe that such information could assist the authority in undertaking or successfully concluding inquiries and criminal proceedings or could result in a request formulated by that authority pursuant to this Convention.

2 *ter*. The transmission of such information shall be without prejudice to inquiries and criminal proceedings in the State of the competent authorities providing the information. The competent authorities receiving the information shall comply with a request that said information remain confidential, even temporarily, or with restrictions on its use.[133]

3. The provisions of this article shall not affect the obligations under any other treaty, bilateral or multilateral, that governs or will govern, in whole or in part, mutual legal assistance.[134]

4. Paragraphs 6 to 21 of this article shall apply to requests made pursuant to this article if the States Parties in question are not bound by a treaty of mutual legal assistance. If those States Parties are bound by such a treaty, the corresponding provisions of that treaty shall apply unless the Parties agree to apply paragraphs 6 to 21 in lieu thereof.

---

[128] Proposal of the delegation of Mexico.

[129] The text in brackets is a proposal of the delegation of China.

[130] Some delegations pointed out that the issues of money-laundering and bank secrecy were still under consideration. This subparagraph would therefore need to be reviewed in the light of agreement on article 4 *bis*.

[131] Proposal of the delegation of China.

[132] Proposal of the delegation of Finland.

[133] Paragraphs 2 *bis* and 2 *ter* were proposed by the delegation of Italy (see A/AC.254/5/Add.8) and received wide support. There were suggestions for refinement of the text, also in order to avoid overlap with the provisions of article 19, on law enforcement cooperation. According to some delegations, a possible model for a more streamlined text might be found in article 28 of the 1999 Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption. One delegation suggested that the two paragraphs could be placed in a separate article entitled "Spontaneous communication of information".

[134] It was suggested at the informal preparatory meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1998 that the substance of this paragraph could be integrated into a more general article on the relationship of the Convention to other bilateral or multilateral treaties.

5. States Parties shall not decline to render mutual legal assistance under this article on the ground of bank secrecy.[135]

6. States Parties may not decline to render mutual legal assistance under this article on the ground of absence of dual criminality, unless the assistance required involves the application of coercive measures.[136]

7. States Parties shall[137] [, where not contrary to fundamental legal principles,] adopt measures sufficient to enable a person in the custody of one State Party whose presence in another State Party is requested to give evidence or assist in the investigations to be transferred if the person consents and if the competent authorities of both States agree.[138] Transfer under this paragraph shall not be for the purpose of standing trial. For the purposes of this paragraph:[139]

(a) The State to which the person is transferred shall have the authority and obligation to keep the person transferred in custody, unless otherwise authorized by the State from which the person was transferred;

---

[135] This paragraph received broad support. However, some delegations expressed reservations about it.

[136] This paragraph received considerable support. However, several delegations expressed reservations on the ground that, in view of the broad scope of the Convention, the principle of dual criminality had to apply to mutual legal assistance. In an effort to find a compromise solution, the delegation of China proposed the formulation below. Several delegations supported the proposal of China.

> "The requested State Party shall be obliged to provide assistance only if the conduct in relation to which the request was made would constitute an offence under its domestic law. However, the requested State Party may, when it deems appropriate, provide assistance, to the extent it may decide at its discretion, irrespective of whether the conduct would constitute an offence under the laws of both the requesting and requested States Parties."

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland proposed as a compromise formulation that the original paragraph be made applicable only to offences established by the Convention.

Some delegations noted that the connection between this paragraph and paragraph 16 should be reviewed.

The delegation of Singapore pointed out that the 1986 Commonwealth Scheme for Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters provided for dual criminality as a ground for refusal.

Some delegations pointed out that the term "coercive measures" might have a different meaning in different jurisdictions.

[137] Although some delegations deemed it important that this provision be mandatory, some other delegations proposed that "shall" be changed to "may". The delegation of Germany proposed the formulation "States shall endeavour to adopt". Some delegations noted that alternative formulations were contained in article 13 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and article 93 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court (A/CONF.183/9).

The delegation of Singapore proposed the formulation of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Model Treaty on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, which reads as follows:

> "Upon the request of the requesting State, and if the requested State agrees and its law so permits, a person in custody in the latter State may, subject to his or her consent, be temporarily transferred to the requesting State to give evidence or to assist in the investigations."

One delegation noted the operational and security implications and suggested the possibility of alternative methods of obtaining the assistance or testimony of the person in custody, which would obviate the need for his or her physical transfer, such as the use of video link facilities.

[138] One delegation proposed that paragraph 20 immediately follow this paragraph.

[139] Some delegations proposed that this paragraph be made into a separate article. Belgium suggested that this paragraph be supplemented with the following text: "If the transferred person flees, the State to which that person was transferred shall take every possible measure to ensure his or her apprehension".

(b) The State to which the person is transferred shall return the person to the custody of the State from which the person was transferred [as soon as circumstances permit][140] or as otherwise agreed by the competent authorities of both States;

(c) The State to which the person is transferred shall not require the State from which the person was transferred to initiate extradition[141] proceedings for the return of the person;

(d) The person transferred shall receive credit for service of the sentence imposed in the State from which he or she was transferred for time served in the custody of the State to which he or she was transferred.[142]

8. States Parties shall designate a central authority or, when necessary, central authorities[143] that shall have the responsibility and power to execute requests for mutual legal assistance or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution. Central authorities shall play an active role in ensuring the speedy execution of requests [, controlling quality and setting priorities].[144] The Secretary-General shall be notified of the authority or authorities designated for this purpose. Transmission of requests for mutual legal assistance and any communication related thereto shall be effected between the authorities designated by the States Parties. This requirement shall be without prejudice to the right of a State Party to require that such requests and communications be addressed to it through diplomatic channels and, in urgent circumstances, where the Parties agree, through the International Criminal Police Organization, if possible.[145]

---

[140] Several delegations proposed the deletion of the words "as soon as circumstances permit". The delegation of China proposed that the phrase be replaced with the words "as soon as the person has finished giving evidence or assisting in the investigations".

[141] The delegation of France proposed that the words "extradition proceedings" be replaced with the words "extradition or other proceedings".

[142] The delegation of Mexico proposed the insertion of the following subparagraph: "The authorities of the requested State Party may be present at proceedings conducted in the requesting State Party."

[143] Some delegations proposed the deletion of the words "or, when necessary, central authorities". Some other delegations were in favour of retaining this reference. Several delegations emphasized that a distinction was necessary between the authorities responsible for receiving or forwarding requests and those competent to execute requests. The delegation of Australia proposed to make this distinction by referring to "central offices" for authorities only receiving or forwarding requests and to "competent authority" for authorities executing requests.

The delegation of China proposed the deletion of the word "central" from this paragraph, or the insertion of the following sentence after the first sentence of this paragraph: "States Parties may also designate other authorities for the same purpose for its special regions or territories that have separate systems of mutual legal assistance." The delegation of Canada referred to a proposal it had made on this matter in document A/AC.254/L.42 and indicated that it would continue consultations with other interested delegations with a view to formulating a text that would attract consensus.

[144] Some delegations proposed the deletion of this phrase in brackets, *inter alia*, on the ground that it could be seen to be in contradiction to the principle of the independence of the judiciary. One delegation recalled that the phrase had been taken from the amendments to the Model Treaty on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters.

[145] Some delegations were of the view that this paragraph, together with the corresponding provision on central authorities in article 10 (Extradition), should be placed in a separate article entitled "Transmission of requests for extradition and mutual assistance", to precede the articles on those issues. It was also proposed that such a separate article should more generally include provisions on channels of communication in connection with different forms of international cooperation in criminal matters.

9. Requests shall be made in writing or, where possible,[146] by any means capable of producing a written record in a language acceptable to the requested State Party, under conditions allowing that Party to establish authenticity.[147] The Secretary-General shall be notified of the language or languages acceptable to each Party. In urgent circumstances and where agreed by the States Parties, requests may be made orally, but shall be confirmed in writing forthwith.

10. A request for mutual legal assistance shall contain:

(a) The identity of the authority making the request;

(b) The subject matter and nature of the investigation, prosecution or proceeding to which the request relates, and the name and the functions of the authority conducting the investigation, prosecution or proceeding;

(c) A summary of the relevant facts, except in relation to requests for the purpose of service of judicial documents;

(d) A description of the assistance sought and details of any particular procedure that the requesting State Party wishes to be followed;

(e) Where possible, the identity, location and nationality of any person concerned;

(f) The purpose for which the evidence, information or action is sought.[148]

11. The requested State Party may request additional information when it appears necessary for the execution of the request in accordance with its domestic law or when it can facilitate such execution.

12. A request shall be executed in accordance with the domestic law of the requested State Party and, to the extent not contrary to the domestic law of the requested Party and where possible, in accordance with the procedures specified in the request.[149]

13. Wherever possible and consistent with fundamental principles of domestic law, a State Party shall permit [encourage] testimony, statements or other forms of assistance to be given via video link or other modern means of communication and, subject to

---

[146] It was agreed at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee to include this clause in order to take into account the limited capabilities of many countries, especially developing countries, and in order to emphasize that modern means of communication are useful for the transmission of urgent requests. One delegation noted that the provision seeks to balance the competing interests of the requesting State to obtain speedy execution of requests and of the requested State to ensure that action is only taken on the basis of credible and substantial information.

[147] The last phrase of this sentence was previously contained in a footnote and was moved into the body of the text pursuant to a proposal made by the delegation of France and widely supported at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[148] At the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee it was pointed out that the source of this paragraph was the 1988 Convention. The delegation of Colombia expressed its preference for a simplified version of the text.

[149] One delegation noted that this paragraph and paragraph 1 overlapped in part.

The delegation of Canada submitted a proposal for reformulation of the text of this paragraph (see A/AC.254/L.42), which received limited support. The delegation of Italy submitted a proposal for reformulation of this paragraph and the addition of another paragraph (see A/AC.254/5/Add.8). The Ad Hoc Committee was of the view that the ideas contained in that proposal merited further consideration. In particular, the second paragraph of that proposal might be considered further in conjunction with paragraph 19 of this article.

domestic law, shall ensure that perjury committed under such circumstances is a criminal offence.[150, 151]

14. The requesting State Party shall not transmit or use information or evidence furnished by the requested Party for investigations, prosecutions or proceedings other than those stated in the request without the prior consent of the requested Party.[152]

15. The requesting State Party may require that the requested Party keep confidential the fact and substance of the request, except to the extent necessary to execute the request. If the requested Party cannot comply with the requirement of confidentiality, it shall promptly inform the requesting Party.

16. Mutual legal assistance may be refused:[153]

(a) If the request is not made in conformity with the provisions of this article;

(b) If the requested State Party considers that execution of the request is likely to prejudice its sovereignty, security, *ordre public* or other essential interests;

(c) If the authorities of the requested State Party would be prohibited by its domestic law from carrying out the action requested with regard to any similar offence,[154] had it been subject to investigation, prosecution or proceedings under their own jurisdiction;[155]

(d) If it would be contrary to the legal system of the requested State Party relating to mutual legal assistance for the request to be granted;[156]

---

[150] Several delegations expressed concern about the criminalization of perjury in this paragraph. The clause on domestic law was inserted to make such criminalization optional and thus meet those concerns. Nevertheless, several delegations expressed their preference for the deletion of the provision.

[151] The delegation of Japan suggested that the adoption of the necessary measures enabling testimony via video link should be optional. The delegation of Italy proposed the insertion of several new paragraphs after paragraph 13 (see A/AC.254/5/Add.8). The first paragraph of that proposal was favourably received at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee as a potential alternative to paragraph 13. The first paragraph of the Italian proposal reads as follows:

> "Where an individual is in the territory of a State Party and has to be heard as a witness or expert by the judicial authorities of another State Party, the first State Party may, at the request of the other, permit the hearing to take place by videoconference if the criminal proceedings for which the hearing was requested provide appropriate guarantees of conformity with its fundamental principles of law and where it is not possible or desirable for the individual in question to appear in person in the territory of the requesting State."

The rest of the proposal made by Italy was found to contain many useful concepts and ideas, but was deemed too lengthy and detailed for an international legal instrument.

[152] One delegation proposed that the use of evidence be restricted only when the requested State so indicated. One delegation proposed that the paragraph be deleted.

[153] One delegation proposed as an additional ground for refusal the fact that the requested State reasonably believed that the offence in question did not involve organized crime.

At the informal preparatory meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1998, it was suggested that other grounds for refusal might be required. One possible additional ground might be a "discrimination clause" as in article 6, paragraph 6, of the 1988 Convention. Another ground might be a "political offence", in which case paragraph 17 would require re-examination.

[154] One delegation noted that the phrase "similar offence" required clarification.

[155] Some delegations expressed reservations about this subparagraph. One delegation proposed that the subparagraph be deleted, since the issue would in any case be regulated by the subparagraph that followed.

[156] Some delegations regarded this ground for refusal as overly broad.

(e) If the offence to which the request relates would not be an offence in the context of criminal organization if committed within its jurisdiction.[157]

17. For the purpose of cooperation under this article, the offences covered by this Convention shall not be considered fiscal offences or political offences[158] or regarded as politically motivated, without prejudice to the constitutional limitations and the fundamental domestic law of the States Parties.

18. Reasons shall be given for any refusal of mutual legal assistance.

19. Mutual legal assistance may be postponed by the requested State Party on the ground that it interferes with an ongoing investigation, prosecution or proceeding. In such a case, the requested Party shall consult with the requesting Party to determine if the assistance can still be given subject to such terms and conditions as the requested Party deems necessary.

20. A witness, expert or other person who consents to give evidence in a proceeding or to assist in an investigation, prosecution or judicial proceeding in the territory of the requesting State Party shall not be prosecuted, detained, punished or subjected to any other restriction of his personal liberty in that territory in respect of acts, omissions or convictions prior to his departure from the territory of the requested Party.[159] Such safe conduct shall cease when the witness, expert or other person having had, for a period of fifteen consecutive days, or for any period agreed upon by the Parties, from the date on which he has been officially informed that his presence is no longer required by the judicial authorities, an opportunity of leaving, has nevertheless remained voluntarily in the territory or, having left it, has returned of his own free will.[160]

21. The ordinary costs of executing a request shall be borne by the requested State Party, unless otherwise agreed by the Parties concerned. If expenses of a substantial or extraordinary nature are or will be required to fulfil the request, the Parties shall consult to determine the terms and conditions under which the request will be executed, as well as the manner in which the costs shall be borne.[161]

22. States Parties shall consider, as may be necessary, the possibility of concluding bilateral or multilateral agreements or arrangements that would serve the purposes of, give practical effect to or enhance the provisions of this article.[162]

---

[157] Some delegations proposed that this subparagraph be deleted.

[158] One delegation was of the view that the "political offence" exception could be discretionary except in certain heinous cases. Another delegation proposed the deletion of the reference to political offences.

[159] One delegation expressed concern about cases where a dangerous offender might deliberately utilize this provision in order to evade justice.

[160] At the informal preparatory meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1998, some delegations thought a degree of discretion could be provided to the requesting State in determining whether to provide safe conduct. One delegation expressed a reservation on this paragraph.

[161] One delegation noted that the wording of this paragraph required clarification.

[162] One delegation noted that the wording of this paragraph required clarification. Another delegation proposed that the paragraph be deleted.

Article 15
Special investigative techniques

1. If permitted by the basic principles of their respective domestic legal systems,[163] States Parties shall take the necessary measures [, within their possibilities,] to provide a legal basis for[164] the [appropriate] use of special investigative techniques, such as controlled delivery, surveillance, including electronic surveillance, and undercover operations for the purpose of gathering evidence and taking legal action against persons involved in an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: in an offence covered by this Convention].[165]

2. States Parties shall consider extending the use of the special investigative techniques referred to in paragraph 1 of this article at the international level, on the basis of agreements or arrangements.

[2 *bis*. States Parties participating in this type of investigation at the international level shall scrupulously respect the terms of reference agreed upon with the competent authorities of the States Parties in which these activities are carried out and shall fully respect the sovereignty of such States.][166]

3. Decisions to use such special investigative techniques at the international level shall be made on a case-by-case basis and may, when necessary, take into consideration financial arrangements and understandings with respect to the exercise of jurisdiction by the States Parties concerned.[167]

4. Decisions to use controlled delivery at the international level may include methods such as intercepting and allowing the goods to continue intact or removed or replaced in whole or in part.

---

[163] This formulation, as used also in the 1988 Convention, was supported by several delegations. Some delegations proposed the alternative formulation of "If permitted by domestic law,".

In general, on the applicability of the language of the 1988 Convention to the drafting of the present article, one delegation cautioned that article 11 of the 1988 Convention focused on the use of one special investigative technique, controlled delivery, at the international level, while the present article examined the use of special investigative techniques at both the national level and the international level.

[164] Some delegations proposed that "to provide a legal basis for" be amended to read "to allow for the appropriate use of". One delegation proposed that "to provide a legal basis for" be amended to read "to provide a lawful basis for".

[165] As noted in the footnote to article 4 *bis*, several delegations noted the need to define these concepts. It was also suggested by some delegations that since the list of measures in this paragraph was not exhaustive and new investigative measures might be developed in response to the evolution of organized crime and of technology, the definitions might also be inserted into the *travaux préparatoires*.

One delegation proposed the addition of "interception of electronic messages" as a special investigatory message. However, several delegations noted that not only was that issue evolving rapidly, but it was also particularly complex and sensitive and therefore should perhaps not be dealt with in the context of the Convention.

Several delegations emphasized the possible need for providing technical assistance to developing countries to support the use of special investigative techniques, as noted in article 21, subparagraph 1 (g). Some delegations suggested that a provision on technical cooperation be inserted in the present article.

[166] This paragraph was submitted by the delegation of Mexico and was not discussed by the Ad Hoc Committee at its first session.

[167] One delegation emphasized the need to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States Parties.

One delegation proposed that the present provision specify, in the same manner as article 14, paragraph 21, the presumptive allocation of the financial burden resulting from the use of special investigative measures at the international level.

Article 16
Transfer of proceedings[168]

States Parties shall give consideration to the possibility of transferring to one another proceedings for criminal prosecution of an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: of an offence covered by this Convention] in cases where such transfer is considered to be in the interests of the proper administration of justice, in particular in cases where more jurisdictions are involved, with a view to concentrating the prosecution.

Article 17
[Establishment of criminal record][169]

Each State Party [may] take legislative measures to [take into consideration] the previous foreign conviction[170] for an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: for an offence covered by this Convention] for the purpose of establishing the criminal history of the alleged offender.

[Article 17 bis
Bribery of witnesses and intimidation of witnesses and officials

Each State Party shall adopt such legislative and other measures as may be necessary to establish as criminal offences the following conduct, when committed intentionally [and involving an organized criminal group]:

---

[168] At the informal preparatory meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1998, some delegations felt that the subject matter of this article could be best treated under article 9, paragraph 5, on jurisdiction, or in connection with article 10, paragraph 9 (as amended by the Ad Hoc Committee at its first session), regarding domestic prosecution in lieu of extradition of nationals.

[169] This article was the subject of extensive discussion at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

While it was agreed that, for purposes of investigation, prosecution and adjudication, information on the criminal history of a suspect or defendant might be requested, there were difficulties in the formal recognition of foreign judgements. No support was voiced at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee for the possibility of taking foreign convictions into account in subsequent sentencing proceedings, although there had been support for that idea at the informal preparatory meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1998.

One delegation noted the need for a safeguard clause, or the insertion of a phrase such as "in accordance with domestic law".

In connection with this article, three possible solutions were envisaged by some delegations: (a) on the basis of article 18 *bis* (Measures to enhance cooperation with law enforcement authorities), information could be exchanged on criminal history; (b) on the basis of article 14 (Mutual legal assistance), States could undertake to respond to requests related to prior convictions of an individual; and (c) the article could be redrafted in a more discretionary manner to read "Each State Party may adopt ..." (as has been done in the present draft).

Several delegations proposed that the article be deleted.

[170] Several delegations noted the need to define the concept of "convictions". One delegation raised the issue of convictions *in absentia* and noted that different legal systems imposed a variety of sanctions through different procedures. One delegation noted that the provision should specify whether the convictions in question should be legally final or should include convictions that were still subject to appeal.

Two delegations proposed that information on the criminal history of the alleged offender include acquittals.

One delegation proposed that provisions be included in the Convention on the exchange of information on criminal, civil and administrative sanctions imposed against corporate bodies or their officers.

One delegation noted that consideration should be given to include provisions on how information on criminal history should be obtained from other Member States.

(a) The offering or giving to a person of an undue advantage in order to interfere with the giving of testimony or production of evidence in relation to the commission of a serious crime;

(b) The use of physical force, threats or intimidation to interfere with the exercise of official duties by a justice or security official[171] or with the giving of testimony or production of evidence in relation to the commission of a serious crime.][172]

Article 18
Protection of witnesses and victims[173]

1. Each State Party shall[174] adopt measures to provide effective and appropriate protection from potential retaliation or intimidation for witnesses in its criminal proceedings[175] who agree to give testimony concerning the crimes covered by this Convention and, as appropriate, for their relatives and other persons close to them.[176]

2. The measures envisaged in paragraph 1 of this article [may] include [, among others,] [, without affecting the right of the defendant to due process]:[177]

(a) Establishing procedures for the physical protection of such persons, such as, to the extent necessary and feasible, relocating them, and to permit, where appropriate, non-disclosure or limitations on disclosure of information concerning the identity and whereabouts of such persons;[178]

(b) Providing evidentiary rules to permit witness testimony to be given in a manner that ensures the safety of the witness, such as permitting testimony to be given through the use of communications technology[179] or other means in a manner not prejudicial to the rights of the defence.[180]

---

[171] For the discussion on the definition of these terms, see footnote 77.

[172] This text was produced at the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee (see A/AC.254/L.40) as the result of a consolidation of the text contained in documents A/AC.254/L.28 and A/AC.254/L.29, in connection with the discussion on article 4 *ter*, on measures against corruption. The text of the present article was not discussed in detail at that session.

[173] The drafting of this article requires further consideration.

[174] Several delegations noted that the use of the categorical "shall" in this paragraph was inappropriate, as the provision of full protection might be practically and financially impossible.

[175] Several delegations noted that the protection should be provided before, during and after the criminal proceedings. One delegation noted that the protection should extend to victims and witnesses involved in proceedings in other States.

[176] This term is intended to cover persons who may be subject to danger by virtue of a particularly close relationship with the witness, but who are not relatives.

One delegation noted that the term required clarification.

Several delegations proposed that the scope of this article be expanded to include not only all persons assisting the authorities in investigation, prosecution and adjudication, but also criminal justice personnel and, for example, the representatives and legal counsel of the victim.

[177] Several delegations noted that some of the measures noted in this paragraph might be in conflict with legal safeguards protecting the defendant. It was also noted that the differences between legal systems should be reflected in the drafting of this paragraph.

[178] Some delegations noted that this might run counter to legal safeguards enjoyed by the defendant.

[179] One delegation suggested that this concept be clarified, in particular if measures in addition to video links were included. One delegation proposed that the term be deleted.

[180] One delegation expressed the view that the text should make clear that these measures need to be consistent with the right of the defence to cross-examination.

3. States Parties [may] consider entering into arrangements with other States for the relocation of persons described in paragraph 1 of this article.

4. States Parties shall take measures to provide assistance to victims[181] of crimes covered by this Convention, enable views and concerns of victims to be presented and considered at appropriate stages of the criminal proceedings against the offenders in a manner not prejudicial to the rights of the defence, and establish procedures relating to restitution by offenders to victims of such crimes.

Article 18 bis

Measures to enhance cooperation with law enforcement authorities

1. States Parties shall promote appropriate[182] methods of obtaining information and testimony from persons who are willing to cooperate in the investigation and prosecution of an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: of an offence covered by this Convention] and shall, as appropriate, assist each other in promoting such cooperation.

2. Each State Party shall [consider the possibility of providing, in accordance with fundamental legal principles, its prosecutorial and judicial authorities with discretion in order to encourage the cooperation referred to in paragraph 1 of this article, for example by providing] [provide for] the possibility, in appropriate cases, of [either or both of the following]:[183]

(a) Granting immunity from prosecution to a person who cooperates substantially with law enforcement authorities in the investigation and prosecution of an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: of an offence covered by this Convention];[184]

(b) Considering the provision by an accused person of substantial cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of an offence established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: of an offence covered by this Convention] as a mitigating factor in determining the person's punishment.

---

[181] Several delegations suggested that issues related to restitution to victims and victim assistance be dealt with in a separate article. One delegation proposed that this separate article could deal in general with human rights issues. Some delegations noted that the terms "assistance", "views and concerns" and "restitution" were ambiguous.

Two delegations requested that specific reference be made of the victim categories of minors, migrants and refugees.

[182] One delegation noted that this paragraph, in particular the use of the word "appropriate", required clarification.

[183] One delegation proposed that subparagraphs (a) and (b) of this paragraph be made facultative, by beginning the paragraph with "In particular, each State Party shall, in accordance with fundamental legal principles, [ensure] [consider the possibility of ensuring] that its domestic legal framework permits the possibility, in appropriate cases, of ...".

One delegation proposed that this paragraph be reformulated as a listing of various measures designed to promote cooperation with law enforcement, including not only the immunity referred to in subparagraph (a) and the mitigation referred to in subparagraph (b), but also the offering of rewards for cooperation and the offering of victim protection arrangements.

[184] Several delegations noted that their legal system did not allow for the possibility of granting immunity, and some called for the deletion of this subparagraph. One delegation noted the dangers to the course of justice that might arise if the authorities had discretionary powers to grant immunity.

One delegation noted that the scope of immunity required clarification in respect of whether it included only the offence under investigation, or any offence committed by the person in question. In either case, according to the delegation, this might have an impact on the rights of the victim.

3. Protection of such persons shall be as provided for in article 18 of this Convention.

Option 1[185]

4. States Parties shall consider entering into arrangements, subject to their national laws, concerning immunities or non-prosecution or reduced penalties for witnesses [from] [resident in] one State whose testimony is required in another State.

Option 2[186]

4. In principle, the benefit of immunity granted to a state witness shall have effect only in the State Party that granted such immunity. If a second State Party acquires the testimony given by a state witness, such testimony may be used against persons other than the person so cooperating. The State utilizing such testimony shall be required to grant the benefit of immunity to the state witness and may consequently not use such testimony or any evidence directly resulting therefrom against such person. Two or more States may jointly grant benefits of immunity when a transnational [criminal] organization is under investigation.

5. A State Party may grant benefits to state witnesses in relation to offences committed in the territory of another State Party, and the cooperation of state witnesses[187] may be evaluated with a view to granting them immunity or reduced penalties in conformity with the laws of the first-mentioned State. When a state witness is required to testify before the court of another country, States shall facilitate his or her transfer to the State requiring such testimony. This privilege shall override the claim of a third State to impose punishment.

Article 19
Law enforcement cooperation[188]

1. States Parties shall consider entering into bilateral and multilateral agreements or arrangements on direct cooperation between their law enforcement agencies.

---

[185] *Rapporteur's note*. Option 1 represents an effort to respond to the comments of some delegations at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee. Other delegations were of the view that the paragraph was not necessary and should be deleted.

[186] Several delegations noted that paragraphs 4 and 5 in option 2 required clarification, and some delegations proposed that the substance be transferred to article 14 (Mutual legal assistance). One delegation proposed that consideration be given to integrating article 18 *bis* and article 18. Several delegations proposed that the two paragraphs in option 2 be deleted. One delegation proposed that consideration be given to the protection of the identity and image of the person in question.

[187] One delegation noted that this paragraph required clarification, since conceptually a state witness was not a defendant and thus did not need to be granted immunity.

[188] At the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee, emphasis was placed on distinguishing between mutual legal assistance, considered in article 14, and law enforcement cooperation. One delegation proposed that, since articles 15, 18, 18 *bis* and 19 dealt with issues that were conceptually different from articles 16 and 17, those four articles should be combined.

One delegation noted the need to train also diplomatic and consular staff in the areas covered by article 19.

The majority of delegations agreed on the importance of article 19 and the need to facilitate law enforcement cooperation. In addition, it was noted that much of the language in the article came directly from the 1988 Convention. It was also noted that softening the provisions would be a step backwards from that instrument.

2. States Parties shall [endeavour to] cooperate closely with one another, consistent with their respective domestic legal and administrative systems, to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement action to combat the offences established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: the offences covered by this Convention]. Each State Party shall,[189] in particular, adopt effective measures:

(a) To establish and maintain channels of communication between their competent authorities, agencies and services, including the designation, where appropriate, of a central authority or authorities,[190] to facilitate the secure and rapid exchange of information concerning all aspects of the offences established in this Convention, including, if the States Parties concerned deem it appropriate, links with other criminal activities;

(b) To cooperate with one another in conducting inquiries, with respect to offences established in this Convention, concerning:

(i) The identity, whereabouts and activities of persons suspected of involvement in the offences established in this Convention;

(ii) The movement of proceeds or property derived from the commission of such offences;

(iii) The movement of instrumentalities used or intended for use in the commission of such offences;

(c) In appropriate cases and if not contrary to domestic law, to establish joint teams, taking into account the need to protect the security of persons and operations, in order to carry out the provisions of this paragraph. Officials of any State Party participating in such teams shall act as authorized by the appropriate[191] authorities of the Party in whose territory the operation is to take place; in all such cases, the States Parties involved shall ensure that the sovereignty of the Party in whose territory the operation is to take place is fully respected;[192]

(d) To provide, when appropriate, necessary items or quantities of substances for analytical or investigative purposes;

(e) To facilitate effective coordination between their competent agencies and services and to promote the exchange of personnel and other experts, including, subject to

---

[189] The delegations of several States noted that the implementation of some of the measures foreseen in the subparagraphs of paragraph 2, such as in subparagraph (e), on liaison officers, should be optional and not obligatory.

[190] Many delegations were of the view that the reference to central authorities should be deleted or placed in brackets, as that concept more properly belonged to mutual legal assistance (article 14). In this connection, it was noted that the provision of the 1988 Convention, on which article 19 was based, did not include a reference to central authorities.

One delegation proposed that law enforcement cooperation take place only through central authorities. Other delegations noted that the designation of the authority or authorities responsible for law enforcement cooperation would depend on, among other factors, the administrative structure of the State. One delegation emphasized the importance of having a contact point in order to pursue the possibilities of law enforcement cooperation.

[191] One delegation proposed the insertion of the word "central". Another delegation opposed it and noted the need to take into consideration the administrative structure of the State when deciding on which authority should be charged with the responsibility referred to in the present paragraph.

[192] One delegation expressed concerns regarding this paragraph. Some other delegations emphasized in this connection the importance of respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

bilateral arrangements or agreements between the States Parties concerned, the posting of liaison officers.[193]

3. States Parties shall cooperate closely in preventing and controlling the offences established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: the offences covered by this Convention]. In particular, they shall, in accordance with their domestic laws or pursuant to bilateral or multilateral agreements or arrangements:[194]

(a) Take all appropriate measures to prevent preparation in their respective territories for the commission of those offences within or outside their territories;

(b) Exchange information in accordance with their national law and coordinate administrative and other measures taken as appropriate to prevent the commission of offences established in article(s) [...] [*alternatively*: of offences covered by this Convention].[195]

[4. States Parties shall:[196]

(a) Designate knowledgeable law enforcement personnel to be available [on a 24-hour basis][197] to respond to transnational organized crime committed through the use of computers, telecommunications networks and other forms of modern technology;[198] and

(b) Review their domestic legislation to ensure that such abuses are adequately addressed.]

Article 20

Collection and [exchange] of information on organized crime[199]

1. States Parties shall consider developing and sharing analytical expertise concerning organized crime activities. In this connection, common definitions, standards and methodologies shall be applied as appropriate.

2. Each of the States Parties shall consider [, with the support of the scientific community,][200] analysing trends in organized crime in its territory, as well as the

---

[193] One delegation suggested that the concept and role of "liaison officers" be clarified. Another State proposed adding to the end of this paragraph the words "as well as, where appropriate, the extension and expansion of the competence of existing liaison officers".

[194] Two delegations proposed that paragraph 3 be transferred to article 22 (Prevention at the national level).

[195] One delegation noted the need to ensure the confidentiality of any information exchanged on the basis of this subparagraph.

[196] Some delegations stressed the need for further consideration of this paragraph, and one delegation proposed its deletion, on the grounds that it imposed significant financial obligations on States Parties. It was suggested that the paragraph should be reformulated so that the measures envisaged would be discretionary.

[197] One delegation proposed the deletion of the words appearing in brackets.

[198] One delegation noted that these measures should be considered also in connection with other types of offences.

[199] Some delegations proposed that this article should deal also with the establishment of international data banks and with the work of the International Criminal Police Organization and corresponding regional arrangements in this connection. One delegation, speaking on behalf of a regional group, stressed the need to establish international data banks that would respond to the needs of developing countries, since the establishment of national data banks would impose a financial obligation on States Parties. The same delegation noted the need to have a linkage with national financial investigative units established to investigate money-laundering.

One delegation noted the need to redraft this article to specify both the objectives and the mechanisms to be used. It was also noted that this article dealt with analytical data, not operational data.

[200] One delegation questioned the inclusion of the phrase appearing in brackets. It was noted in response that the phrase was intended to emphasize the importance of utilizing academic research to improve the quality and effectiveness of the response to organized crime.

circumstances in which organized crime can operate, the professional groups involved and the communications technologies.

3. States Parties shall consider monitoring their policies and actual measures to prevent and combat organized crime and shall make assessments of their effectiveness and efficiency.[201]

4. The Secretary-General, with the assistance of the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute and the other institutes in the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network, shall undertake to collect and analyse public information and research findings concerning organized crime, prepare overviews of global trends in organized crime and prepare inventories of policies and measures to prevent and control organized crime.[202]

Article 21
Training and technical assistance[203]

1. Each State Party shall, to the extent necessary, initiate, develop or improve a specific training programme for its law enforcement personnel, including prosecutors, investigating magistrates and customs personnel, and other personnel charged with the prevention and control of the offences covered by this Convention. Such programmes may include secondments and exchanges. Such programmes shall deal, in particular, with the following:[204]

(a) Methods used in the prevention, detection and control[205] of the offences established in this Convention;

---

[201] One delegation proposed that paragraphs 3 and 4 be transferred to article 23.

[202] The possibility of transferring this paragraph to article 23 was to be considered. One delegation proposed the insertion of the words "and other scientific and specialized bodies, as well as regional bodies," after the words "Programme network".

One delegation drew attention to the financial implications of this paragraph and noted that the style of the paragraph would be more appropriate in a resolution than in a Convention.

Two delegations proposed the inclusion of a paragraph on the responsibility of States Parties to provide the Secretary-General with the information referred to in this paragraph.

[203] One delegation noted that this article should also contain a paragraph on the role of the United Nations in the provision of training and technical assistance.

One delegation, speaking on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of 77 and China, stressed the need for an article on the provision of financial assistance to developing countries and undertook to provide a text for the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee. The delegation also stressed the need to include in the Convention an article on international development cooperation.

One delegation noted that, although the wording of this paragraph was based on the 1988 Convention, the scope of that Convention was more limited. Therefore, consideration should be given to the appropriateness of this wording in a convention on transnational organized crime, which would have a considerably broader scope.

One delegation noted the need to draw the attention of Governments and regional cooperation agencies to the importance of the issues dealt with in this article.

[204] It was suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee might wish to consider the establishment, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources, of a database that would include training materials as well as information concerning available training programmes. It was also noted that this task could be carried out by an institute in the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme network.

[205] One delegation expressed concern about the appropriateness of this term in this context.

(b) Routes and techniques used by persons suspected of involvement in offences established in this Convention, including in transit States, and appropriate countermeasures;

(c) Monitoring of import and export of contraband;

(d) Detection and monitoring of the movements of proceeds and property derived from offences covered by this Convention, instrumentalities used in the commission of such offences and methods used for the transfer, concealment or disguise of such proceeds, property and instrumentalities, and other methods used in combating money-laundering and other financial crimes;

(e) Collection of evidence;

(f) Control techniques in free trade zones and free ports;

(g) Modern law enforcement equipment and techniques, including electronic surveillance, controlled deliveries and undercover operations;

(h) Methods used in combating transnational organized crime committed through the use of computers, telecommunications networks or other forms of modern technology [; and

(i) Methods used in the protection of victims and witnesses].

2. States Parties shall assist one another in planning and implementing research and training programmes designed to share expertise in the areas referred to in paragraph 1 of this article and, to this end, shall also, when appropriate, use regional and international conferences and seminars to promote cooperation and to stimulate discussion on problems of mutual concern, including the special problems and needs of transit States.

3. States Parties shall promote other techniques for mutual education that will facilitate extradition and mutual legal assistance. Such techniques may include language training, secondments and exchanges between personnel in central authorities or agencies with relevant responsibilities.

4. States Parties may conclude bilateral or multilateral agreements on material and logistical assistance, taking into consideration the financial arrangements necessary for the means of international cooperation provided for by the present Convention to be effective and for the prevention and control of transnational organized crime.

5. In the case of existing bilateral and multilateral agreements, States Parties shall strengthen [, to the extent necessary,] efforts to maximize operational and training activities within the International Criminal Police Organization [and the Customs Cooperation Council] and within other relevant bilateral and multilateral agreements or arrangements.

Article 22[206]

Prevention at the national level

1. With a view to reducing existing or future opportunities for criminal organizations to participate in legal markets while acquiring illegal gains through activities such as illegal trafficking in motor vehicles, firearms, women and children and immigrants,

[206] Proposed by the delegation of the Netherlands at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee (A/AC.254/L.3).

States Parties shall take appropriate legislative and administrative measures, in particular:[207]

(a) To prevent the misuse of legal persons by organized crime through:

(i) The collection and storage of information on legal persons and natural persons involved in their establishment, management and funding;[208]

(ii) The deprivation of the right of persons convicted for organized criminal activities to act as directors of legal persons incorporated in their jurisdiction;[209]

(iii) The establishment of national registers of persons disqualified as directors of legal persons; and

(iv) The exchange of the types of information referred to under subparagraphs (a) (i) and (iii) of this paragraph with competent authorities of other States Parties;

(b) To strengthen cooperation between public and relevant private organizations, including industries;[210]

(c) To promote the development of standards and procedures designed to safeguard the integrity of public and private organizations, as well as codes of conduct for relevant professions, in particular lawyers, notaries public, tax consultants and accountants; and

(d) To exclude from participation in tender procedures conducted by public authorities applicants[211] who have been convicted for offences connected with organized crime and to deny subsidies or licences to such applicants.

2. With a view to reducing existing or future opportunities for criminal organizations to recruit new members from vulnerable groups of the population,[212] States Parties shall establish adequate prevention programmes.[213]

---

[207] Many delegations were of the view that the language of this paragraph is too mandatory. Those delegations also expressed concern about the limited scope of the provision, especially with regard to the specific reference to offences, in view of the ongoing consideration of the scope of the Convention and the additional international legal instruments.

One delegation was of the opinion that the first paragraph of the original text should be retained. That paragraph was as follows: "1. States Parties shall consider taking steps to reduce to the extent possible existing social, legal, [cultural,] administrative, technical [or any other] opportunities for criminal organizations to commit [profitable crimes] [any punishable offence] and to alleviate the circumstances that make socially marginalized groups vulnerable to the prospect of a criminal career." The words "or any other" and "any punishable offence" were suggested by that delegation. Other delegations recommended the addition of the word "cultural".

One delegation was of the view that the article should cover not only illegal markets, but also the risk posed by organized criminal groups to legal markets by virtue of their efforts to infiltrate them.

[208] One delegation expressed concern about the protection of personal data and information.

[209] Many delegations thought that the provision of this and the subsequent subparagraphs were too far-reaching. Several delegations expressed the view that measures such as these should be linked with the gravity of the offence and the size of the legal person and that the exclusion should be limited in time. Other delegations advocated the retention of these measures, supplemented perhaps with the necessary safeguard clauses.

[210] For example, cooperation between a law enforcement agency and the car industry and insurance companies to prevent the theft of motor vehicles.

[211] Natural persons as well as legal persons.

[212] Several delegations were of the view that caution was required in dealing with the issue of vulnerable groups.

[213] Several delegations were of the view that this paragraph should be more specific with regard to the measures to be taken, especially in view of its mandatory nature. One delegation noted that the measures should include cultural programmes and the use of the media, including the cinema.

3. With a view to reducing recidivism, States Parties shall assist in reintegrating into society, for example through vocational and educational training, persons convicted of having engaged in organized criminal activities.[214]

4. Each of the States Parties shall consider:

(a) Undertaking an analysis of patterns of and trends in transnational organized crime by systematically gathering information on organized crime within its territory;

(b) Developing national projects[215] aimed at the prevention of transnational organized crime; and

(c) Establishing and promoting best practices to prevent transnational organized crime.

[5. States Parties shall undertake to ensure that their organs and services, in particular their security services, under no circumstances cooperate with criminal organizations in any way other than using individual informers to fight the types of crime in which such organizations engage.][216]

Article 22 bis[217]
Prevention at the international level

States Parties shall collaborate with each other and relevant international organizations in promoting and developing the measures referred to in article 22 of this Convention, in particular through:

(a) The nomination of a focal point;

(b) The exchange of information on patterns of and trends in transnational organized crime and on best practices for the prevention of transnational organized crime; and

(c) The participation in international projects[218] aimed at the prevention of transnational organized crime.

Article 22 ter[219]
Communications from States Parties

In order to promote progress in the implementation of the Convention, each of the States Parties shall communicate, within [...] months of the entry into force of the Convention and periodically thereafter, information on its policies and measures to implement the Convention. This information shall be reviewed by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention at its first session and periodically thereafter, in accordance with article 23 of this Convention.

---

[214] In particular, young or low-ranking participants in criminal organizations.

[215] Either pilot or field projects.

[216] At the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, most delegations were of the view that this paragraph should be deleted. Two delegations expressed the wish to retain this paragraph.

[217] A number of delegations were of the view that this provision required clarification and that it was too obligatory in nature.

[218] Either pilot or field projects.

[219] Proposed by the delegation of Austria at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee (for an explanatory note, see the non-paper submitted by the delegation of Austria (A/AC.254/5/Add.3); see also footnotes 223 and 224 below).

Option 1

Article 23

Role of the United Nations and other relevant organizations[220]

1. For the purpose of examining the progress made by States Parties in achieving the fulfilment of the obligations undertaken in the present Convention, these States will provide periodic reports to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, which will carry out the functions hereinafter provided.

2. States Parties undertake to provide such reports within two years of the entry into force of the Convention for the State concerned, and thereafter every five years.

3. Reports made under the present article shall indicate factors and difficulties, if any, affecting the degree of fulfilment of the obligations under the present Convention. Reports shall also contain sufficient information to provide the Commission with a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of the Convention in the States concerned.

4. A State Party that has submitted a comprehensive initial report to the Commission need not, in its subsequent reports submitted in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article, repeat basic information previously provided.

5. The Commission may request from the States Parties further information relevant to the implementation of the Convention.

6. States Parties shall provide, as appropriate, reports to the Secretary-General on current and emerging organized crime activities within their territory,[221] as well as on their experience with preventive measures and control measures.[222]

7. The Commission shall make its recommendations and submit reports on its activities to the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with existing provisions.

8. States Parties shall make their reports widely available to the public within their own territory.[223]

9. In order to foster the effective implementation of the Convention and to encourage international cooperation in the field covered by the Convention:

(a) Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and other invited multilateral organizations shall be entitled to be represented at the consideration of the

---

[220] A number of delegations were of the view that option 1 would not provide for an effective monitoring mechanism. Some delegations also questioned the appropriateness of reporting to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, whose membership might not coincide with the signatories to the Convention. Furthermore, it was suggested that a monitoring or follow-up mechanism would require a thorough discussion of issues such as confidentiality in respect of any reports containing sensitive operational information and involvement of non-governmental organizations.

[221] Some delegations felt that it might be difficult for States Parties to provide reports on sensitive ongoing investigations.

[222] It was suggested that provisions might be inserted in this article on the possible role of the United Nations in preparing reports on current and emerging organized criminal activities, as well as on national experience with preventive measures and countermeasures, and in collecting and analysing information and research findings.

[223] A number of delegations thought that public dissemination of reports might not be advisable.

implementation of provisions of the present Convention that fall within the scope of their mandate. The Commission may invite the specialized agencies and other United Nations entities to submit reports on the implementation of the Convention in areas falling within the scope of their activities;

(b) The Commission shall transmit, as it may consider appropriate, to the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, other multilateral organizations and the specialized agencies any reports from the States Parties that contain a request, or indicate a need, for technical advice or assistance, along with the Commission's observations and suggestions, if any, on those requests or indications;

(c) The Commission may recommend to the Economic and Social Council that it request the Secretary-General to undertake on its behalf studies on specific issues relating to the control and prevention of organized crime;

(d) The Commission may make suggestions and general recommendations based on information received pursuant to article(s) [...] of the present Convention. Such suggestions and general recommendations shall be transmitted to any State Party concerned and reported to the Economic and Social Council, together with comments, if any, from the States Parties.

Option 2

Article 23
Monitoring of implementation

1. States Parties shall cooperate in carrying out a programme of systematic monitoring of the implementation of the measures provided for by this Convention to combat organized crime.

2. A committee of the States Parties shall be established for the purpose of carrying out monitoring functions under this article. The Committee shall:

(a) Adopt periodic reports evaluating implementation by States Parties and adopt and issue reports on its own activities;

(b) Promulgate procedures for assessing the level of implementation by States Parties (including with respect to submission of information by the Party being evaluated, the formation of evaluation teams made up of experts from States Parties to visit that Party and preparation of a preliminary evaluation for consideration by the Committee, and the discussion and adoption of the final evaluation report) and for carrying out its other functions.

3. Meetings of the Committee shall be held in [*insert location*] once a year or, where circumstances require, in special session. They shall be held in camera.

4. Every effort shall be made to reach decisions by consensus in the Committee. If consensus cannot be reached, decisions on substantive matters must be approved by a two-thirds majority of those States Parties present and voting, an absolute majority of States Parties constituting a quorum, while decisions on procedural matters shall be taken by a simple majority of those States Parties present and voting.

5. Expenses incurred in conjunction with the work of the Committee shall be paid from assessed contributions made by States Parties and voluntary

contributions from Governments, international organizations, individuals, corporations and other entities, in accordance with relevant criteria adopted by the Committee.

Option 3[224]

Article 23

Conference of the Parties to the Convention

1. A Conference of the Parties to this Convention is hereby established.

2. The Conference, as the supreme body of this Convention, shall keep under regular review the implementation of the Convention and any legal instruments related to the Convention and shall make, within its mandate, the decisions necessary to promote the effective monitoring and implementation of the Convention. To this end, the Conference shall:

(a) Periodically examine the obligations of the Parties and the institutional arrangements under the Convention, in the light of the objectives of the Convention, the experience gained in its implementation and the evolution of scientific and technological knowledge;

(b) Promote and facilitate the exchange of information on measures adopted by the Parties to counter transnational organized crime;

(c) Assess, on the basis of all information made available to it in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the implementation of the Convention by the States Parties, the overall effect of the measures taken pursuant to the Convention and the extent to which progress is being made towards the achievement of the objectives of the Convention;[225]

(d) Consider and adopt regular reports on the implementation of the Convention;

(e) Make recommendations on any matters necessary for the implementation of the Convention;

(f) Seek to mobilize financial resources pursuant to articles 21 and 22 of the Convention;

(g) Agree upon and adopt, by consensus, its own rules of procedure and financial rules;

(h) Seek and utilize, where appropriate, the services and cooperation of and information provided by competent international organizations and inter-governmental and non-governmental bodies.

3. The Conference shall adopt its rules of procedure at its first session.

4. The first session of the Conference shall be convened by the Centre for International Crime Prevention of the Secretariat of the United Nations and shall take

[224] Option 3 is a proposal of the delegation of Austria, intended to replace options 1 and 2 on article 23. It was submitted during the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee and preliminarily discussed. The delegation of Austria also submitted explanatory notes on option 3 in a non-paper (A/AC.254/5/Add.3). The proposal consists of new articles 22 *ter*, 23 and 23 *bis* of the Convention.

[225] There is a need for an article on the provision of information by States Parties for the evaluation of the progress made in the implementation of the Convention (see article 22 *ter*).

place not later than one year after the date of entry into force of the Convention. Thereafter, regular sessions of the Conference shall be held every year unless otherwise decided by the Conference.

5. [*Text on the participation of observers to be added.*]

Article 23 bis[226]
Secretariat

1. The Centre for International Crime Prevention of the Secretariat of the United Nations shall act as the secretariat of the Convention.

2. The functions of the secretariat shall be:

(a) To make arrangements for sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and to provide services for those sessions as required;

(b) To compile and submit reports to the Conference;

(c) To facilitate the provision of assistance, upon request, to the Parties, in particular Parties that are developing countries, in the compilation and communication of information required in accordance with the provisions of the Convention;

(d) To prepare reports on its activities and present them to the Conference;

(e) To ensure the necessary coordination with the secretariats of other relevant international bodies;

(f) To assist States Parties, upon request, in analysing patterns and trends in transnational organized crime;

(g) To set up a database of best practices developed by States Parties for the prevention of transnational organized crime;

(h) To establish a network of contact persons from States Parties and, where appropriate, to facilitate the organization of meetings for the contact persons;

(i) To promote and facilitate the organization of seminars and conferences for other national experts on the prevention of transnational organized crime;

(j) To promote or facilitate the development by States Parties of international pilot projects and, where appropriate, to evaluate the pilot projects.[227]

[226] It was noted that the role proposed for the Centre for International Crime Prevention would have significant budgetary implications and would require careful consideration.

[227] Subparagraphs 2 (f)-(j) of this article are based on the version of article 22 proposed by the delegation of the Netherlands (A/AC.254/L.3).

[*Article 23 ter*
Implementation of the Convention

1. Each State Party shall take the necessary measures, including legislative and administrative measures, in accordance with the fundamental principles of its domestic legal system, to ensure the implementation of its obligations under this Convention.

2. Each State Party may adopt more strict or severe measures than those provided for by this Convention for the prevention and control of transnational organized crime.][228]

Article 24
Relation with other conventions[229]

Option 1

This Convention shall not prejudice the application of other United Nations conventions on criminal matters.

Option 2

The provisions of the present Convention shall prevail over those of other United Nations conventions dealing with the same matters.[230]

Option 3

No provision of this Convention shall be construed as preventing the States Parties from engaging in mutual cooperation within the framework of other international agreements, whether bilateral or multilateral, currently in force or concluded in the future, or pursuant to any other applicable arrangement or practice.

---

[228] The text of this article is a reformulation of paragraphs 1-3 of article 6 (A/AC.254/4/Rev.3).

[229] The discussion on article 24 at the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee focused on options 1 and 2 of the article as presented in the revised draft Convention (A/AC.254/4/Rev.1). Some delegations suggested that the article should deal not only with the relation between the present Convention and other United Nations conventions, but also with its relation to bilateral and multilateral treaties and arrangements in general. It was also suggested that the article should specify the relation between Protocols to the present Convention and other international treaties and arrangements.

A number of delegations expressed a preference for option 1 on the grounds that States Parties to existing bilateral and multilateral instruments often assumed obligations that went beyond those to be contained in the present Convention and that States Parties should continue to respect those obligations. Other delegations expressed a preference for option 2 on the grounds that applying a number of agreements and conventions could lead to conflict. It was also suggested by one delegation that the issue of which convention would prevail could depend on the individual issue at hand. Other delegations suggested that any option under this article would have to be enriched and a differentiation would have to be made between the measures addressed.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed that the exchange of views on the article at its second session was only preliminary, since no decision should be made on the contents of the article until the earlier, substantive articles of the Convention had been discussed. A number of additional proposals were made for the formulation of article 24, and the Ad Hoc Committee decided that those proposals should be included as new options 3 and 4.

[230] One delegation noted that it could accept option 2 as the working text if the words "the same matters" were to be replaced with the words "organized crime".

Option 4

1. The provisions of this Convention that relate to international cooperation will in no way affect the application of broader provisions of bilateral or multilateral agreements in force between States Parties. The other provisions of this Convention shall prevail over those provisions which deal with the same questions in other conventions already concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

2. States Parties may apply article(s) [...] of this Convention to other multilateral conventions to the extent agreed to by States Parties.[231]

3. States Parties may conclude bilateral or multilateral agreements or arrangements with a view to facilitating the application of the principles and procedures of this Convention.

4. States Parties may conclude bilateral or multilateral agreements or arrangements for the application of one or more provisions of this Convention to other forms of criminal behaviour.

Article 25
Settlement of disputes[232]

1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention [and its Protocols] that cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time[233] shall, at the request of one of those Parties, be submitted to arbitration. If, six months after the date of the request for arbitration, those States Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.

2. Each State Party may, at the time of [signature,] ratification [, acceptance] or [approval] of this Convention, declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of this article with respect to any State Party that has made such a reservation.[234]

3. Any State Party that has made a reservation[235] in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article may at any time withdraw that reservation by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

---

[231] This paragraph was originally paragraph 10 of article 2 and was moved to article 24 pursuant to a proposal by some delegations at the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee.

[232] Some delegations proposed that article 32 of the 1988 Convention would be a more appropriate model for this paragraph, in that it referred not simply to negotiation and arbitration, but in greater detail to "negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, recourse to regional bodies, judicial process or other peaceful means of their [the Parties'] own choice". Other delegations, however, essentially supported the present formulation, since it was based on the 1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (General Assembly resolution 52/164, annex), which was more recent than the 1988 Convention.

[233] Some delegations were of the view that the term "reasonable time" was ambiguous.

[234] One delegation noted that the issue of a declaration would apply only to cases involving the compulsory settlement of disputes. Some delegations proposed that paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 25, together with the appropriate paragraphs from article 26, should be placed in a separate article on reservations. Other delegations, however, noted that reservations in respect of the resolution of conflicts were an issue that should be kept in article 25, separate from the issue of reservations in general.

[235] One delegation proposed that the word "reservation" be replaced with the word "declaration".

Article 26
Signature, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession and reservations

1. This Convention shall be open to all States for signature from [...] to [...] and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until [...].

2. The present Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval. Instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

[3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall receive and circulate to all States the text of reservations made by States Parties at the time of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.][236]

[4. A reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the present Convention shall not be permitted.]

[5. Reservations may be withdrawn at any time by notification to that effect addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall then inform all States. Such notification shall take effect on the date on which it is received by the Secretary-General.]

6. This Convention is subject to accession by any State. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

[*Article 26 bis*
Relation with Protocols[237]

1. This Convention may be supplemented by one or more Protocols.

2. In order to become a Party to a Protocol, a State must also be a Party to the Convention.

3. A State Party to the Convention is not bound by a Protocol unless it has expressly accepted the Protocol.

4. Any Protocol by which a State Party is bound shall, for that State Party, form an integral part of this Convention.]

---

[236] Some delegations were of the view that paragraphs 3-5 were not appropriate. The observation was also made that in order to ensure that reservations could not be made, an express provision to that effect was required. Otherwise, general international law on treaties (and in particular the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties) would nonetheless allow reservations to be made. Other delegations expressed their preference for an article that would specifically allow for reservations and some delegations proposed that these three paragraphs be placed in a separate article. One delegation proposed for consideration the possibility that only some provisions of the Convention would be subject to reservations. Finally, some delegations noted that the issue of reservations could not be decided until the contents of the Convention had been decided. It was therefore decided to place paragraphs 3-5 in brackets for the time being.

[237] Paragraphs 1-3 of article 26 *bis* were based on a proposal by the delegation of Australia (A/AC.254/L.13) and paragraph 4 was proposed by the delegation of Poland (A/AC.254/5/Add.3). Several delegations noted their support for the proposal. However, several delegations recalled that in paragraph 18 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its first session (A/AC.254/9) it had been noted that, as the additional international legal instruments might require a broad scope, the possibility could not be excluded that they might be independent from the Convention.

Article 27
Entry into force

1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the [...][238] instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

2. For each State Party ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twentieth instrument of such action, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of that relevant instrument.

Article 28
Amendment

1. A State Party may propose an amendment and file it with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Secretary-General shall thereupon communicate the proposed amendment to the States Parties, with a request that they indicate whether they favour a conference of States Parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposals. In the event that, within four months from the date of such communication, at least one third of the States favour such a conference, the Secretary-General shall convene the conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Any amendment adopted by a majority of States Parties present and voting at the conference shall be submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval.

2. An amendment adopted in accordance with paragraph 1 of the present article shall enter into force when it has been approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations and accepted by a two-thirds majority of the States Parties.

3. When an amendment enters into force, it shall be binding on those States Parties which have accepted it, other States Parties still being bound by the provisions of the present Convention and any earlier amendments that they have accepted.

Article 29
Denunciation

A State Party may denounce the present Convention by written notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Denunciation becomes effective one year after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary-General.

Article 30
Languages and depositary

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations is designated depositary of the present Convention.

[238] Some delegations proposed 20 as the appropriate number of ratifications, since this would make it possible for the Convention to enter into force in a relatively brief period. Other delegations proposed that the number of ratifications required should be higher (for example, 40-60) in order to emphasize the global nature of the Convention. One delegation noted that a low number of ratifications would be appropriate should it be possible to make reservations to the Convention.

2. The original of the present Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Convention.

Attachment

1. As noted in footnote 3 to article 2 of the revised draft Convention (see above), the Ad Hoc Committee at its second session accepted a compromise proposal by its Chairman that a list of offences, which could be either indicative or exhaustive, could be included either in an annex to the Convention or in the *travaux préparatoires*. This list would, however, need to be supplemented with proposals from States. (For details see the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on its second session (A/AC.254/11).)

2. The following list was taken from former paragraph 3 of article 2 (see A/AC.254/4/Rev.1):

"[3. For the purposes of the application of paragraph 1 above, 'serious crime' shall be deemed to include, among others, acts such as the following:

"(a) Illicit traffic in narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances and money-laundering, as defined in the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;[a]

"(b) Traffic in persons, as defined in the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others of 1949;[b]

"(c) Counterfeiting currency, as defined in the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency of 1929;[c]

"(d) Illicit traffic in or stealing of cultural objects, as defined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property of 1970,[d] and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects of 1995;

"(e) Stealing of nuclear material, its misuse or threats to misuse or harm the public, as defined by the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material of 1980;[e]

"(f) Acts contained in the United Nations conventions against terrorism;[f]

---

[a] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.91.XI.6.

[b] Resolution 317 (IV), annex. The delegation of the Philippines proposed that the definition be expanded, as the 1949 Convention did not address new contemporary forms of trafficking. That delegation proposed that the definition of "traffic in persons" be elaborated and made clearer, using the international standards formulated in the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926 and the 1953 Protocol Amending the Slavery Convention and the Platform for Action of the Fourth World Conference on Women (*Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-15 September 1995* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.13), resolution 1, annex II).

[c] *League of Nations Treaty Series*, vol. 112, p. 171.

[d] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 823, No. 11806.

[e] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1456, No. 24631.

[f] Some delegations proposed that reference be made to the 1998 Arab Convention on Combating Terrorism. Some delegations were of the view that the Convention, while not intended as an instrument against terrorism, should endeavour to cover the emerging links between terrorist acts and organized crime.

"(g) Illicit manufacture of and traffic in firearms, their parts and components, ammunition, or explosive materials or devices;[g]

"(h) Illicit traffic in or stealing of motor vehicles, their parts and components; and

"(i) Corruption of public officials and officials of private institutions.[h]]"

3. The following list was circulated at the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee by Mexico on behalf of several delegations:

(a) Illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances;

(b) Money-laundering;

(c) Traffic in persons, in particular women and children;

(d) Illicit traffic in and transport of migrants;

(e) Counterfeiting currency;

(f) Illicit traffic in or stealing of cultural objects;

(g) Illicit traffic in or stealing of nuclear material, its use or threatening to misuse it;

(h) Acts of terrorism;

(i) Illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related material;

(j) Illicit traffic in or stealing of motor vehicles, their parts and components;

(k) Acts of corruption;

(l) Illicit traffic in human organs;

(m) Illicit access to or illicit use of computer systems and electronic equipment, including electronic transfer of funds;

(n) Kidnapping;

(o) Illicit traffic in or stealing of biological and genetic materials.

4. The following list was proposed by the Government of Egypt:

(a) Illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances and money-laundering;

(b) Traffic in persons, in particular women and children;

(c) Illicit traffic in and transport of migrants;

(d) Counterfeiting currency;

(e) Illicit traffic in or stealing of cultural objects;

---

[g] One delegation proposed that the definition used in the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials should be used.

[h] Individual delegations proposed the inclusion of illicit traffic in women and children under subparagraph 3 (b), as well as the inclusion of the following as additional subparagraphs: illicit traffic in migrants; illicit traffic in endangered animals; illicit traffic in human body parts; illicit access to computer systems and equipment; piracy; kidnapping for ransom; and murder and other grave offences against persons.

(f) Illicit traffic in or stealing of nuclear material, its use or threatening to misuse it;

(g) Acts of terrorism as defined in the pertinent international conventions;

(h) Illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related material;

(i) Illicit traffic in or stealing of motor vehicles, their parts and components;

(j) Acts of corruption;

(k) Illicit traffic in human body organs;

(l) Illicit access to or illicit use of computer systems and electronic equipment, including electronic transfer of funds;

(m) Illicit traffic in or stealing of biological and genetic materials.